ADVERTISEMENT.

A Confession of Faith, put forth by the *Elders* and *Brethren* of many Congregations of *Christians*, (Baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in *London* and the *Country*. With an Appendix concerning *Baptism*. Printed for *John Harris*, at the *Harrow* against the *Church* in the *Poultrey*, 1690. *Price Bound* 1 s.

Page 10, line 12, *read* of a Title for Baptism to them.

ADVERTISEMENT.

A Confession of Faith, put forth by the *Elders* and *Brethren* of many Congregations of *Christians*, (Baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in *London* and the *Country*. With an Appendix concerning *Baptism*. Printed for *John Harris*, at the *Harrow* against the *Church* in the *Poultrey*, 1690. *Price Bound* 1 s.

Page 10, line 12, *read* of a Title for Baptism to them.

A Solemn Call

Unto all that would be owned as Christ's Faithful Witnesses, speedily, and seriously, to attend unto the Primitive Purity of the Gospel Doctrine and Worship: Or, a Discourse concerning

BAPTISM:

WHEREIN

That of Infants is Disproved, as having no Footing, nor Foundation at all in the Word of GOD. By way of Answer to the Arguments made use of by Mr. *William Allen*, Mr. *Sidenham*, Mr. *Baxter*, Dr. *Burtoogge*, and others, for the Support of that Practice.

Wherein the Covenant made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, *Exod.* 20. That in the Land of *Moab*, *Deut.* 29. As also the Covenant of *Circumcision* made with *Abraham* *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. Whereon so much stress is laid for the Support of Infants Baptism, are plainly proved to be no other than three several Editions of the Covenant of Works; And consequently, that no just Argument can thence be deduced for the Justification of that Practice.

Together with a Description of that truly Evangelical Covenant, GOD was pleased to make with Believing *Abraham*; containing the Sum of the Everlasting Gospel then Preached unto him; since Proclaimed by the Apostles; and which now remains to be yet further Published unto every Nation, Kindred, Tongue, and People, for the Obedience of Faith.

By *Philip Cary*, a Lover of Truth and Peace.

LONDON:
Printed for *John Harris*, at the Sign of the *Harrow* in the *Poultry* over against the Church. M. DC XC.

#87 Brickell 12.1.30 7/24 Exempt

1690
C333
S

TO THE READER.

WE *are doubtleſs brought forth in a Day to which many Glorious Prophecies contained in the Holy Scriptures have a ſpecial reference; amongſt others, that which is recorded* Dan. 12. 4. Many ſhall run to and fro, and Knowledg ſhall be increaſed. *Antichriſtian Darkneſs hath ſo covered the* European Nations *for many Hundreds of Years, that the Truths and Ordinances of Chriſt were generally Corrupted and Obſcured; till our Bleſſed Reformers,* Luther, Calvin, &c. *were raiſed up in ſome good meaſure, to detect the corruptions of Antichriſt, and to bring to Light that bleſſed Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith, in the Blood of Chriſt, with ſeveral other Truths of great Importance.*

And ſince that, God has been pleaſed to raiſe up many Learned Men, namely Dr. Ames, *Mr.* Ainſworth, *and Dr.* Owen, *with others, who have Learnedly, and with much clearneſs and ſtrength of Argument made it appear, that a true Goſpel viſible* Church, *is to conſiſt only of ſuch as are Saints by Profeſſion, and who give up themſelves to the Lord, and one to another by Solemn Agreement, to practiſe the Ordinances of* Chriſt.

And now of latter Years the Lord hath been pleaſed to raiſe up ſome worthy and learned Men to detect the vanity of Infant Baptiſm, *who by ſolid Arguments have made the unlawfulneſs thereof appear.*

The main Arguments that are made uſe of by Pædobaptiſts *for the ſupport of their Practice herein, are taken from the* Covenant *with* Abraham, Gen. 17. 2, 3, 4, &c. *Some of themſelves confeſſing, That Arguments taken from the* Baptizing *of whole Families, from* Chriſt's *bleſſing little*

tle Children, and from 1 Cor. 7, 14. *have no weight in them. And as for those Arguments which are taken from the* Covenant *made with* Abraham *above-mentioned, several of our Learned Authors have thorowly examined, and sufficiently answered. Notwithstanding we cannot without Injury to Truth omit to recommend the Labours of this our worthy Brother, who having had the advantage of other Men's Writings, that have gone before him, and so standing on their Shoulders, may see further than they did. Yet he hath some Notions of so rare a Nature, that he is not beholding to any other for them, but only to his own studiousness and dexterity, and the Blessing of God upon his Labours.*

We freely acknowledge, that many Learned and Holy Men, whom we much Honour, do differ from us in the point of Baptism, *yet we must not let go any Truth of God for their sakes: And we doubt not, but the time is drawing nigh, when God will cause the Light of His Holy Word so to shine forth, that all remaining Darkness on the Minds of the Lord's People shall vanish away; and then* Sion's Builders *shall no more take a Stone for a Corner, nor a Stone for a Foundation of* Babylons Rubbish.

And now (Christian Reader) *seeing the Author hath taken so great pains in Writing this Treatise for the Information of thee and others, in a great Gospel Ordinance; be thou perswaded to lay by prejudice, and read diligently, examine it by the Holy Scriptures; and if thou meet with any thing of Truth, wherein thou wast not before Inlightened, subject to it, least thou be found rejecting the authority of Christ.* Quod Dei est, agnosce, & quod hominis est, ignosce. *If any Glory may come to* Christ, *or comfort to his Members hereby, it is enough, and as much as is aimed at by the* Author, *and thy Soul Friends,*

Will. Kiffin, Rob. Steed,
John Harris, Ben. Keech.
Rich. Adams,

To

TO THE READER.

READER,

HAving had a ſight of this Piece (without the Privity of the Author) before it went to the Preſs, I Read it with much Delight (though in great haſte) and thought good without his Knowledge, or being Deſired, to give thee (if thou beeſt a Stranger to him) this aſſurance by the way, that thou wilt find his Lines altogether free from Lightneſs, as alſo from Reflections or Reproaches towards thoſe of the Perſwaſion he contends with; which is a thing ſo rare, that it deſerves a Remark, and ſavours much of a right ſerious Chriſtian Spirit. I have had Knowledge of him many Years, but never knew (or heard) him otherwiſe repreſented, then of a very ſober Character, ſuitable to his Writings; a Man every way free from any of thoſe Temptations that might incline him to eſpouſe any Intereſt, or fall in with any Perſwaſion, otherwiſe than what he did freely out of pure Choice, and as ſatisfi'd with its Purity, upon a diligent and conſcionable Peruſal of the Holy Scriptures, in which he has been a very laborious Searcher theſe many Years, and in whom that Text is verified, 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16. That they make the Man of

God wise unto Salvation, &c. *I am assured that his Papers were intended only for private Use, and for satisfaction of some that desired to know what he had to say to the Arguments here reply'd to. He has all the appearances of a Man low in his own Eyes, yet willing in his capacity to serve the Lord Jesus freely, without seeking in the least any advantage to himself in the service of the Gospel; being much above those low Ends that too too many are sway'd by, of making a Gain by his Preaching; and though his Labours be constant, yet he seeks no other reward, then Christ's* Well done, &c. *being very well contented with that Income for his Subsistence, which the Lord affords in the use of his honest and honourable Calling; in which also he has been beneficial to many, and a great Blessing to the Poor; so that by his Faithfulness and Usefulness in his Spirituals and Temporals he is well reported of amongst all. It would be a great Happiness both to the Church of Christ and Common-Wealth, if the number of such Worthys were every where increased: And yet I fear that this good Man in these his Faithful endeavours to reduce Christian Practice to Primitive Institution (though done with all Mildness and much Demonstration) will meet with hard Usage from that sort of Men, which in every Age have chiefly sought what would please Man, and have still quarrelled at all endeavours towards Reformation: Witness those hardships which the Faithful met with from the* Papists *for many Generations, for their* Nonconformity *to their* Inventions, *and those difficulties that obstructed the Reception of the great Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone in the Mediator. How dear did it cost many of the Ancients before it could be obtained that the People should receive the* Lord's Supper *in both Kinds, which the* Papists *still deny to them? How long was it before the Disciples of* Augustine *and* Innocent *the First, would give over that Practice of giving the* Lord's Supper *in a Spoon*

to

to Children assoon as they were Baptized; *which held (as* Maldonate *affirms) about* 600 *Years? And to this Day, How many are contending for the* Cross *in Baptism? For which thing (though very Un-scriptural, yet) some of the deep Wits of that Way do form a Plea, but by mistaken and very invalid Consequentes. And many of the Wise and Learned of the Church of* England *are of Opinion, That unless it be granted that the* Church *has a Liberty from Christ to alter or add Ceremonies at her discretion, they know no Authority for the Baptizing of Infants, or the Sprinkling of Water upon their Faces to be accounted Baptism; for few deny but that the ancient way was by going into the Water, and Plunging under Water. Nay, our Disciplinarians that have made strong Pleas for Reformation in many things, must, and do confess, that their strongest Plea for Infant Baptism is drawn from a very remote Consequence, even as far off from the Command of Christ, or the Practice of the Apostles; as that they ground it on the First* Jewish Ordinance, *Commanded unto* Abraham *and his Posterity,* viz. Circumcision, *which was never intended to be of any value after the time of* Christ's Reformation. Heb. 9. 10. *And is it not to be lamented that after so many Years search, no better Footing should be found for the Practising a* New Testament Sacrament, *than an* Old Testament Jewish Institution? *May not such men as will infer, that Holy Orders should be Hereditary, and that the Work of the Ministry should be Intailed upon their Posterity, because it was anciently settled upon the Children of* Levi, *besides whom none might Minister in the Sanctuary? And why may not Infants by a clearer Consequence partake of the Table of the Lord, assoon as they are able to Eat and Drink it; it being taken for granted by* Pædobaptists *that the Supper comes in the room of the Passover, and that all in the Family that were capable to Eat Flesh might Eat it.* Exod. 12. 4. *Nay,*

any Strangers in their Families were not excluded that we Read of, that might be present at the Passover. And thus we might Instance in many things.

It is not the business of this Author to prove *the Baptism of Believers, for that is a thing that was never yet denied or oppos'd, by any that Plead for Infants right to it: For they confess, That to Baptize Believers is a clear and unquestionable Truth, agreeing most plainly with the precept of the Lord Jesus, and Practice of the Apostles. But the Controversie is, whether Infants (of Believers, or others) have a Scriptural right to it, or not? And here thou shalt find every Point from whence any Plea is deduced, to prove the right of Infants to that Ordinance answered, with such Evidence of Scripture Demonstration, and with so much Faithfulness, that (unless thou hast no Conscience towards these things) it must beget in thee at least some new Considerations about the Point, if not a better Opinion of that despised People, that make Conscience not to admit any to Baptism, but Professed Believers.*

The Circumcision of Children *was not left doubtful to the Jews, but they had full Direction in the Case, both for the Subject and the Part to be Circumcised, the time and manner also. Was there such care in that time, and in such a Point, about a thing that was to end with the Jewish Church, Law and Priest-hood; and yet no care taken by the Lord Jesus to give future Ages Light in Infant Baptism, in case it were His Mind it should be Practised? I could never yet meet with the Man that could pretend to know at what time Children should or ought to be Baptized, supposing they had a right to it. In Ancient time it was Administred but twice in the Year; and since that appointed to be upon some Festival. But I find now, all do act at Pleasure, none among us regarding the Day of Circumcision,* viz. the eighth Day; *though some in* Cyprian's *time would limit it to that*

Day,

Day, when the practice began first to be Introduced by some few Persons, out of a conceit of its Absolute Necessity to Salvation, from a mistake of John 3. 5. *But some now hasten it sooner; some defer it to a Fortnight, some three Weeks, a Month, and more. And several of the* Eastern Churches *to this very day, Baptize not, until the 40th. day after they are born; and then give them the* Supper *also, as some approved Authors report. So that all, for the most part, order the time, as may best suit with their other Aims, of managing it with State, Pomp and Honour, and the presence of such Friends as may be absent, to make it the more gainful and splendid. Now if no time can be set exactly, why should they be censured, who out of Conscience, defer to communicate so Holy an Ordinance to their Children, till they are taught in the Faith of Christ, and profess to believe it with their Heart? Must it not seem strange, I say, to any Man that reads, with what care the Lord gave charge, concerning the Circumcising of Children as well as Men; giving them the very Circumstance of time as aforesaid, on which it should be performed, and which* Moses *injoyned to* Israel, *which was part of his Faithfulness in his House, that yet we should think it is the Mind of the Lord Jesus, (who was most faithful in his own House) that little Children should be Baptized, and not so much as once express it by Himself, or Apostles? We find* Women *and* Children *particularly mentioned by the Apostle, upon very small Occasions, as in* Acts 21. 5. *where the taking notice of Children is of very little moment; and yet, where we have an Account who should be Baptized, (as in Christ's Commission) and of those Multitudes, that in many places were Baptized; Is it not strange that no Child should be mentioned, if such had been, or were to have been Baptized? The Apostle took care in* Acts 8. 12. *to Record, that the Multitude then Baptized, were both* [Men and Women.] *If Children had been*

then

then Baptized, surely the Holy Spirit, would not have omitted that one Word [Children.] *And so* Acts 5. 14. *We have mention of Multitudes added to the Church, and expres'd particularly,* [both Women men and ~~Children~~] *Now if their Children had been taken in with them, would not the Holy Spirit have mentioned it, whilst he foresaw of what need it would be in future Ages, to warrant his People to do the like? The Holy Scriptures therefore being wholly silent, in the point of little Childrens Admittance, and nothing found for it in either Precept or President, what may more clearly be inferred. But to conclude, that the Baptism of little Children, is more of Man than of God, or wholly of Man, and not of God.*

I could never yet learn what material Benefit an Infant received by Baptism. It cannot be a bringing them into Covenant with God, because it is upon Supposition, that they are in Covenant, by vertue of their believing Parents, one or both, that a Plea is made for their Baptism. The most that can be said or pretended to, is, that it brings them into Christ's visible Flock. But alas, what Priviledge is this, whilst the Child is there, but as one asleep? Nay, when this Child comes to Understanding, it must not partake of any other Benefits in that Church, more than one Unbaptized may do, until it comes to Confession of Faith and Repentance, and receive Confirmation; and this Child after Baptism, as it grows up, is Preach'd to (as much as any other) as in a state of Nature, and consequently the Child of Wrath, and never like to come into the presence of God with comfort, without Regeneration, or actual Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; by all which it appears, That the Priviledges pretended to, are but Nominal, and without any substance of Reallity. What then is this noise of Priviledges made with Rhetorical Flourishes, but a meer Shadow and Pretence, to keep up an Opinion, for an Unscriptural Practice in the Favour

vour of the People, who are ready to be led to any thing by their Guides? As for Infants being the Subjects of Christian Baptism, it deserves to be well considered, who gave command for it, either God or Man? And for the manner of Baptizing by sprinkling Water on the Face only, by whose Direction was it? And where is the Scripture from whence any Probability may be found, that that part should be sprinkled more than any other? Why not the Breast, as a sign of the Hearts being sprinkled from an evil Conscience? Or the Arms that should manage the Shield? Or the Feet, in token of being shod with the Preparation of the Gospel of Peace? Or rather that part, that of old was appointed to be circumcised, in token of Regeneration? I know 'tis frequently urged by the Pœdobaptists, *to those of the contrary Perswasion: Where do you find that* Children *are at any time, or in any place forbidden* Christian Baptism? *Which is a strange kind of Plea. The very* Jews *were never in their greatest Apostacy, so corrupt in their reasoning, that ever I heard of: It was enough that they practiced what they were commanded. Is the Text of no force, or quite forgotten, which tells us,* That secret things belong to God, but revealed things to us? *Would he have Infants Baptized before Faith, and not Reveal it?*

I could wish therefore, that all empty Pleas on either side, were put away, and careful Attendance given to things weighty and material. The changes that have been seen in the Opinions of men, as times have varied in these late years, may justly put every considerate man, upon the conscionable search, after what is the very Mind of Christ *in the Holy Scriptures, and not to take any thing upon anothers credit, whilst that Word is made intelligible, and unto which we may have all free Recourse.*

I know there are some prophane ones, that will take a Liberty to question the Truth of the Holy Scriptures, *but yet that*

that ſhould not affright good men, from ſearching after the very mind of the Spirit *in them; if our Fathers had not done ſo, we had abode in the depth of Antichriſtian Darkneſs. I wonder that thoſe that plead for the Right of the* Seed of Believers, *to* Chriſtian Baptiſm, *from* Circumciſion, *do not as earneſtly plead for a right for the Unbelieving Wife, from the right of the Husband, and for the Servants alſo, whatever they be, ſince ſuch were not only admitted, but commanded to be* Circumciſed? *Why are not our* American Planters, *that buy multitudes of* Negro's, *required to baptize them as faſt as they buy them, and their* Children *born in their Plantations? Methinks it ſhould clearly follow, from the ſame way of arguing.*

But to conclude, What is Abraham *to us? We muſt make our claim to Holy Things by a right to* Chriſt, *as being begotten by him, who is the great and only Head of the* New Covenant, *and prove Infants Right to him, or Deſcent from him, or elſe all will be found as Dung and Droſs. I ſhall not detain thee longer (being not to diſpute, but to glance at things) from beholding at large in this Treatiſe, this great Point particularly handled; and if thou art but as ſerious and Impartial in reading it, as the Author, (whoſe Pardon I crave, for adding this without his Knowledge) I verily believe was in writing it, thou wilt not think thy money nor labour loſt. Now the God of Truth and Peace, that hath made his very mind communicable to us, through his dear Son, give us all Light therein, and willing minds to obey him. So Prays*

Thy Faithful Friend,

M. E.

THE PREFACE TO THE Christian Reader.

I *Do now Preſent Thee with a New Treatiſe of* Baptiſm, *wherein that of Believers, is Aſſerted to be the only true Chriſtian Baptiſm, by way of Oppoſition to that of Infants: Which I hope thou wilt find in the Enſuing Diſcourſe to be Demonſtrated, and with Scripture Evidence to be cleared up, notwithſtanding the many plauſible Arguments or Objections which are uſually urged for the ſupport of the contrary Practice. In the Compiling of which, after having Humbly and Earneſtly Implored the Divine Aſſiſtance: I do confeſs that I have been much beholding to the pious Induſtry, and laborious Travels of others that have trodden the ſame Path, and have gone before me treating upon the ſame Subject, from whom I have been ſupplied with many of the Materials in point of Argument, which this preſent Diſcourſe is furniſh'd with.*

I know it will be objected, that the preſent Work is needleſs, unleſs any thing further be produced than hath been by others al-

already Urged, and argued in this present Controversie. By way of Answer unto which, I have two things to offer.

First; *That though very much hath been already said by others, that have Laboured in the same Province, and that with that clearness of* Evidence, *and Scripture Demonstration, by way of Opposition unto Infant Sprinkling, as cannot be refuted, unless another Canon or Scripture Oracle can be produced for the Justification thereof, than we have yet met with; yet those several Works of theirs having their several Excellencies, and some of them being Voluminous, I judged it no needless or unprofitable Labour, to Collect the Sum or Substance of what hath been already said in this Respect, and to present it to thy View in one Intire Piece; and that with as much Succinctness and Brevity as the Matter would well require.*

The Second is this; That peradventure thou may'st find, upon a due Perusal of the ensuing Discourse, an Improvement of several Considerable Scriptures and Arguments to this purpose, in the present Essay, that hath not yet been made publick, that I know of, by any other hand; and in particular, among diverse others, as to what concerns the true Nature and Difference betwixt the two Covenants, that of Works, and that of Grace: Wherein I think I have plainly proved, that the Covenant which God made with Israel *at* Mount Sinai. Exod. 20. *That made with the same People in the Land of* Moab. Deut. 29. *As also the Covenant of Circumcision made with* Abraham. Gen. 17. 7. 8. 9. *Whereon so much stress is laid for the Support of Infants Baptism, were all of them no other than three several Repetitions of the Covenant of Works; and that as contra-distinct, or essentially different from the* Covenant of Grace, *and consequently now Repealed. Which I have the rather taken the pains distinctly to prove, because upon this Hypothesis, or Supposition, that these were Gospel* Covenants, *differing from the New Cove-*

nant

nant only in the manner of Administration, the greatest part of the most plausible Arguments for the support of Infants Baptism, are founded. But if I have substantially proved that neither of these forementioned Covenants *were Gospel* Covenants, *reaching Gentile Believers and their Seed, but Essentially different therefrom, and consequently now repealed; no wonder if I have made an answerable Improvement thereof, by way of Opposition to the forementioned Practice.*

The Design therefore, and Scope of the following Treatise, (Beside what concerns the Nature and Difference betwixt the two Covenants, *the true Knowledge and Understanding whereof, is indeed of highest Importance to us) is, with all Humility, to endeavour the Rectification of that which I cannot but apprehend to have been amiss, and the promoting of that which I cannot but Judge to have been greatly defective among many that are right dear and precious in the sight of* GOD; *And that is (among other things) in respect of the Purity of that Divine Worship, which as the Servants of* Christ *we are obliged to offer up to Him, in a due Susception and Administration of that* Sacred *and* Solemn Ordinance *of* Baptism, *we are now contending about. My Reasons why I so think, I have now given you in this present Discourse. And certainly the Purity of Divine Appointments, is worthy pleading for; it hath been the subject matter of many Prayers, and should be of our joynt Endeavours.*

We Read in the Prophecy of Zechary, *of a* Candlestick *all of Gold.* Zec. 4. 2. 3. And he said unto me, What seest thou? And I said, I have looked, and behold a Candlestick all of Gold, with a Bowl upon the top of it, and the Seven Lamps thereon, and Seven Pipes to the Seven Lamps, which were upon the top thereof; and two Olive Trees by it, one upon the right side of the Bowl, and the other upon the left side thereof. And Verse 12. I answered again and said unto him; What

be

be theſe two Olive Branches, which through the two Golden Pipes, empty the Golden Oyl out of themſelves? *By the concurring conſent of all Interpreters, I ſuppoſe by this* Candleſtick *all of Gold here ſpoken of, we are to underſtand that pure* Church State *which God hath promiſed to erect unto Himſelf in Goſpel Times. And certainly that muſt be a bleſſed Day, and a glorious Priviledge, when we ſhall come to have a* Candleſtick *all of Gold. A* Candleſtick *that hath a Golden Bowl, Golden Lamps, and Golden Pipes, for the reception and conveyance of the Golden Oyl. Will it not be a ſingular Favour to be the* Children *of that* Church: *All whoſe Members are Golden Members; whoſe Miniſters and Ordinances alſo are All of Gold, for the conveyance of the Golden Oyl of the Heavenly Bleſſing to the Comfort, Enlightning and Satisfaction of the whole? But alas! So it is, that for the moſt part of thoſe that call themſelves, or that pretend to be the true* Churches of Chriſt *at this day in the World, they are far from being a* Candleſtick all of Gold, *whether in reſpect of their Conſtitution and Miniſtry, or in reſpect of that Purity of Ordinances which God requires. For whilſt men do content themſelves rather, as it were with Leaden Pipes, that is, with Ordinances of an Humane Invention, the* Golden Pipes, *or* Ordinances *of God's Appointment, are thereby neglected and made void. And then no wonder if ſuch a* Church *have alſo many Leaden* Members, *or ſuch as are unſuitable unto the* Goſpel Characters All of Gold, *being rather ignorant, prophane and ſcandalous; who coming in, or being admitted at the wrong Door, are there ſuffered alſo to continue, to the hardning, and Soul-ruine of themſelves: which is the caſe of Millions, who without* Chriſt's *Appointment, having been* Sprinkled, *or as they call it,* Chriſtned *in their Infancy, as having by vertue of their Natural Birth, an Intereſt in the* Covenant of Grace, *are Induced thereby to reckon themſelves good* Chriſtians,

and

and in a State of Salvation, without looking after the New Birth, or being acquainted with the Mystery of the Spirit of Regeneration.

It is no way to be doubted, but that where there is a pure Church, there are pure Ordinances. The Pipes are all of Gold, as well as the Church or Candlestick it self; that is, it hath only such Ordinances, as have the stamp of Heaven upon them; even the things which Christ hath commanded, and those observed as he hath commanded, and not otherwise. And it is equally as clear, that where those Golden Pipes are wanting, or where the purity of Gospel Ordinances is neglected, and Pipes of a baser Alloy, are substituted in the Room of those of Christ's Appointment; and those also mis-applied about wrong Subjects, there can be no true *Church; much less can it pretend to that* Purity *that Christ expects. There can be no true Church, but what hath a Golden Constitution, Golden Lamps, and Golden Pipes for the Conveyance of the Golden Oyl. And if you say that you have not been without sufficient Experience of the Gracious Presence and Blessing of Christ, with and upon you in your present way; I will not deny, but take it for granted that so it is: Yet this I will say, that we are under no Promise of having the Golden Oyl conveyed unto us, but through the Golden Pipes.* Teach them (*says Christ*) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World. *If therefore we step out of Christ's way, we cannot rationally suppose our selves, to be, at least, so immediately, under the Influence of Christ's Blessing. What Christ may graciously afford unto his People that sincerely seek unto him, according to the best light they have, though the Sanctuary Preparation may in some Points be Defective, is one thing; and what we may justly expect by vertue of a standing Promise, is another. Certainly, the nearer we come to him, and the more Exact and Punctual we are in the Expressions of our Love*

Love and Friendship to him, the more groundedly may we Expect the Answerable Discoveries of his Loving Favour unto us; and we can no otherwise demonstrate our Friendship, than by being obedient to him, in the Observation of all those things which he hath commanded us; and that both whatsoever they are, and howsoever he hath injoyned the Performance of them. That the Baptism of Believers is appointed by Christ as a Golden Pipe, among the rest of the Golden Pipes of the New Testament Church, *for the Conveyance of the Golden Oyl, or the Heavenly Unction, from himself to his Members, is an undeniable Truth, and cannot with any Justness of Pretence be contradicted. That the Baptism of Infants deserves that Character, is more than what the Scriptures do declare unto us; and peradventure at long run, you also may see Cause to say the same.*

Indeed, if a thorow Reformation in this Point might once be obtained; that is, if Ministers Teach First, and then Baptize such only as Profess Faith in the Lord Jesus, and newness of Life, evidenced by a Holy Conversation (that being the only Practice warrantable by, and Exemplified in the Word of God.) We might then justly hope to see the Accomplishment of the forementioned Divine Prediction: A Candlestick all of Gold: *A Candlestick that hath a Golden Bowl, Golden Lamps, and Golden Pipes; that is,* a Pure Church-State, *wholly Constituted and Regulated according to the Divine Prescription and Pattern. And then also it would inevitably follow, that the Papal Antichristian* Church *must of Necessity Vanish and Expire: Since the Matter of that Synagogue, is the Collective Body of the Nations, who having been sprinkled in their Infant State, are thence beguiled into a Blind and Soul-cheating Delusion, that they are good Christians, and true Members of the* Catholick Church; *whom yet, because of their Unbelief and Prophaneness; the Word of God Excludes from the Gospel* Church, *and consequently from*

from Baptiſm till Converted. And I make no queſtion but it will be at laſt found, that to uphold the preſent Practice of Infant Sprinkling, is no other than to uphold and ſupport the main Pillar of that Apoſtate and Adulterous Church; that is, by bringing the Church into the World, and the World into the Church. And when the World is once brought into the Church; let us ſhew any difference if we can, betwixt that and the World; which yet our Saviour tells us are diſtinct, having choſen his Church out of the World. *John* 15. 19. *'Tis true, the time will be when* the Kingdoms of this World ſhall become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt: *But that cannot be pretended unto, in the preſent Adminiſtration of things, in the Heavens, and Earth that now are; wherein, we cannot ſay that one of a Thouſand, much leſs, that the whole World, is ſubject unto Chriſt's Scepter; and conſequently, far from the true Characters of Church-Memberſhip, according to the Goſpel Rule,* All of Gold. *Indeed 'tis great pity, but that* every Plant which our Heavenly Father hath not planted ſhould be Rooted up, *and the preſent Corrupt Practice of Infant ſprinkling among the reſt; ſince there is nothing that can be more evident than this, that were but this corner Stone, that ſupports the Antichriſtian Fabrick, quite removed, the whole Building muſt of neceſſity totter; and then we might juſtly hope for a* pure Church-State: *Till which, as we cannot groundedly expect true Peace or Settlement in the World; ſo neither can we juſtly expect that* the Name of the City ſhould be called *Jehovah Shammah*, the Lord is there.

The Occaſion of the preſent Diſcourſe, was from a late Treatiſe of Mr. William Allen; *Entituled,* A Serious and Friendly Addreſs to the Nonconformiſts. Beginning with the Anabaptiſts: *Or an Addition to a former Treatiſe of his; Entituled,* a Perſwaſive to Peace and Unity. *Wherein he doth Labour with utmoſt Strength, and force of Argu-*

Argument, to induce those of a contrary Perswasion from himself to a Conformity, and Compliance with the Church Discipline, and Government then Established in these Nations; and particularly, in Respect of the present Practice of Infants Baptism. An Answer to which you will find in the Ensuing Sheets; together, with Answers to all other the most considerable Arguments, which are urged by others also to the same purpose As for Mr. Allen, *he is a Person, altogether unknown to me: But though his Apprehensions and mine, are different in the present point: And though he hath endeavoured to whet up his Arguments with utmost keeness, and lays them on with greatest force; condemning us as guilty of the greatest Schism, and of all those Direful Evils that are the Natural Consequents of a Schismatical Separation from a true Church; yet to give him his due, his Language is fair, and his Discourse free from those Fiery and Passionate Heats, that usually attend Discourses of this Nature from other Pens. I suppose he will have no Cause to complain of being otherwise dealt with in the present Answer. Sure it is,* That the Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteousness of God. *I pray God that the present Reply may be made Instrumental to the opening his Eyes, that he may see from whence he is fallen, and Repent, and do his first Works.* Since the Writing of this, *I am informed of Mr.* Allen's *Decease. I make no question but that he and others also, will sooner or latter be convinc'd, that the horrible guilt of Schism, and the consequent Evils attendant thereon, were so far from being justly Chargeable on us, because of our present Practice; that these things do rather lie at the Doors of those that thus condemn us. I have endeavoured indeed to speak with as much Advantage as I could, to the Conviction of him, and others, that I cannot but apprehend, to walk in a corrupt Path in this Respect: And having so done, I know no Reason any have to be offended, if they be in Love exhorted also to their Duty.* Exhort one another dayly

dayly (*saith the Holy Spirit*) lest any of you be hardned through the Deceitfulness of Sin. *And in like manner, we are bid to* provoke one another to Love, and to good Works. *Whereof, this is none of the least, and Wherein, peradventure, upon a due and further Consideration, you may find your selves to have been as yet Deficient.*

I Would by no means be understood in all this Discourse, as if I intended to lay more than the proper stress, upon the Ordinance we are Contending about. For most true it is, that though the Golden Oyl of the Heavenly Blessing, according to the standing Promises of the Gospel, is only, or for the most part, to be Conveyed to us, through the Golden Pipes of Gospel Ordinances, which should Engage us to the faithful Owning and Practice of them, and not to Indulge our selves in any Negligence, Deviation, or Regardlessness about them; yet nevertheless, as great would the Errour be on the other hand, and it may be greater, to take up our Rest here: For let the Pipes be never so pure and clean; Or let the Ordinances we plead for, be never so punctually Observed, according to the Divine Institution, and the Pattern received in the Holy Mount; yet 'tis the Fountain must supply the Pipe, else it will yield nothing. The best Ordinances are dry and barren things in themselves, unless by them, the Golden Oyl from Christ himself be derived unto us. It is an undoubted Truth, that these he is pleased to make use of; and therefore we are bound Conscionably to attend upon the Ministration of them: But if our Faith ascend no higher, than to fix upon the means; no wonder, if the best means, or the cleerest Pipes do not yield forth unto us, that Spiritual Relief we are seeking after.

To Conclude; I hope therefore, it will be our Joynt Prayer and Endeavour, to be more than Outward Court-Worshippers: *Even that we may be such, as are got into that; that is,* within the Vail, having the Father's Name Written

in

in our Fore-Heads, Redeemed from the Earth, and being without Fault before the Throne of God. *The Purity of Divine Institutions, we must not forget, or be Regardless concerning*; *Otherwise, we cannot please our Great Lord and Master*: *But let us be sure to press through all External Mediums, whatsoever, that we may not fail of being admitted into the Innermost Recesses of the Divine Glory, even in that Secret of God's Presence, which is the proper Receptacle, and Habitation of the Blessed. Thus prayeth,*

Thy most Unworthy,

but Affectionate Servant,

for Christ's Sake,

Philip Cary.

THE

THE CONTENTS OF THE FIRST PART.

MR. Allen's *First Argument against* Antipædobaptists; *from the silence of the Scripture concerning the Baptism of Persons at Age, whose Parents were Christians.* Answered. Page 1

His Second Argument from Mat. 19. 14. Suffer little Children, and forbid them not, to come unto Me, *&c.* Answered. p. 2 3 4 5

His Third Argument from Rom. 11. 16, 17. If the Root be Holy so are the Branches, *&c.* Answered. p. 6

His Fourth Argument from 1 Cor. 7. 14. Else were your Children unclean, but now are they Holy. Answered. p. 8 9

His Fifth Argument from Acts 2. 38, 39. The Promise is to you and your Children, *&c.* Answered. p. 9 10

His Sixth Argument from Col. 2. 11. Buried with him in Baptism, *&c.* Answered. p. 10 11 12 13

His Seventh Argument from the Church Member-ship of Infants under the former Administration. Answered. *From* p. 11 *to* 13 14 15 16

The latter part of Mr. Allen's *Discourse; wherein he Labours to prove the Lawfulness of Imposing other Ceremonies in the management of God's Worship, beside what God Himself hath Appointed.* Answered *from* p. 17 *to* p. 3

The Second Part.

Containing a distinct and more particular Consideration of the Arguments drawn from Rom. 11. 16. 17. *Together with all other the most material Arguments, which are usually urged for the Support of Infants Baptism.*

As

As for the Arguments drawn from Rom. 11. 16, 17. *From thence it is urged;*

First, *That the Gentiles have the ſame Graffing into the true Olive which the Jews formerly had; Our Graffing in being Anſwerable to their preſent Caſting out: Now when they were taken in, they and their Children were taken in; when they were broken off, they and their Children were broken off: And therefore if our Graffing in be anſwerable to theirs, we and our Children are Graffed in together.* Anſwered. p. 23 24

Secondly; *Since our Graffing into the Olive Tree, the Church, is anſwerable to that of the Jews; Their Infants being Graffed in by Circumciſion, ſo muſt ours by Baptiſm.* Anſwered. p. 24 25

Thirdly; If the Fruit be Holy, the Lump is alſo Holy. And if the Root be Holy, ſo are the Branches. Anſwered. p. 26

Fourthly. The Church of the Jews, and that of the Gentiles is ſtill the ſame; that is, it is ſtill the ſame Viſible Church now that it was then. And ſo much the Apoſtles Simile or Metaphor of Ingraffing will bear, or it ſignifies nothing: And if the viſible Church be the ſame, why ſhould not the Subjects be the ſame, viz. *Children; and the Privi-ledge be the ſame,* viz. *an External Badge given to the Children of the Church now, as well as under the Law?* Anſwered. p. 27

Fifthly. As the ſame Church continued under the Goſpel which did exiſt, or was in being before: So the very ſame Church Members kept their places and ſtanding in it, which were of it before, except ſuch as were broken off by Unbelief, which muſt not be underſtood in reference to the little Children of the Believing Jews; unleſs it can be made out that their little Children were guilty alſo of the ſame Sin of Unbelief, upon the Account of which others were thus broken off. Anſwered. p. 32

Sixthly.

Sixthly. Since the Jewish Infants were under the former Administration; at the Call, Election, and Appointment of God, admitted with their Parents, as visible Members of the Jewish Church; And since the Gifts and Callings of God are without Repentance. *Rom.* 11. 29. *We have Reason therefore to Conclude, that the Infants of Christian Parents have the same right to a visible Church Membership now, as theirs had then.* Answered. p. 23.

Seventhly. If such Infants are as much of the Church, and as much Abrahams spirituall seed, as ever Infants in the Old Testament Church were; then they can be no more uncapable than they were, of a Sollemn Admission into the Church by the Ordinance of Initiation for the time being, as Baptism is now, as Circumcision was then. Answered. p. 34.

Eightly. The Believing Gentiles are now graffed in not upon the Legall Branch, but upon the Root Olive, which affordeth all the Nourishment that either the Jews had, or the Gentiles have; which Root Olive is the Covenant of Promise, that was 430. yeares before the Law. Now unto that state of things, wherein not the Law, but the Gospel preached to Abraham did Obtain, God was God not onely to the Father, but to the Children; yea to all his Family. And the Father of the Family did not onely give himself, but all his Children, and even his Servants, all his, to God, to take his Sign upon them; and so it must be now. Answered. p. 28, 29.

But for the further support of Infants Baptism; it is *Objected*,

First. *That since Infants stood visible Members of the Church for 2000 years under the Legal Administration; It is unlikely they should be now Excluded.* Answered from p. 27 to 30.

Obj 2. *If Infants are now Excluded, there would be a very great change in the Extent of the Covenant; Narrower under the Gospel, than it was under the Law; And yet no notice in all the Book of God given of such a change.* Answered.

swered *from*. p. 30 *to* 36.
Obj. 3. *The Believing Jews should have lost upon their Repentance, and belief of the Gospel; if their Children formerly Church-Members should now be Excluded upon the Faith and Repentance of their Parents*. Answered. p. 37.
Obj. 4. *What hope can we have of our Infants, if they must not be admitted to Christian Baptism, nor reputed as Members of the common Body, and Church of the faithful*. Answered. p. 38.
Obj. 5. *If Children may not now be Baptized, this makes the Priviledge of Believers under the Gospel to be less than was theirs under the Law: for their Children were all admitted as Members of the Visible Church, by the Ordinance of Circumcision, and we cannot but Conclude that Priviledges for our selves and for our Children, are at least, as Honourable, Large, and Comfortable as theirs*. Answered. p. 38, 39.
Obj. 6. *Circumcision was a Seal of the New Covenant to Believers and their Seed under the Law; and therefore so is Baptism to the Seed of Christian Parents under the Gospel: The denial therefore of Baptism to Infants, is the denial of a great Priviledge which of Right belongs unto them*. Answered. p. 39, 40.
Obj. 7. *Circumcision was Administred to Believers as Believers; and to their Seed after them as such; to which Baptism was to correspond*. Answered. p. 40, 41.
Obj. 8. *Since by the Express Command of God, the Jewish Infants were Circumcised; Are not now Infants as Capable of Answering the Ends of Christian Baptism, as theirs of Circumcision?* Answered. p. 41, 42.
Obj. 9. *If the Infants of Believing Gentiles are not to be Baptized; How doth the Blessing of* Abraham *come on the Gentiles?* Gal. 3. 14. *Which Blessing of* Abraham *was*, I will be a God unto thee and to thy Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7. Answered. p. 42. 43.

Obj.

Obj. 10. *Then also how can Believers be Heirs according to the Promise*, Gal. 24. *If their Children should be excluded from the Promise? For the Childrens right to the Promise, is part of the Fathers Inheritance: For the Promise unto* Abraham *was*; I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed after thee. Answered. p. 44, 45.

Obj. 11. *Those to whom the Gospel Covenant belonged, to them the Seal thereof appertained: But to* Believers *and their Seed the Gospel Covenant belonged*, Gen. 17. 7. I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed; *therefore to them the Seal thereof did appertain: For the* Fœderati, *were to be* Signati; *that is those that were in Covenant, were to have the Seal thereof*, Gen. 17. 10. *By way of consequence therefore it naturally follows, that if Circumcision, the Seal of the Gospel Covenant, belonged to the Seed of Believers under the Law, then doth the Gospel Seal Baptism, much more appertain to the Seed of Believers now*, Answered *from* p. 45. *to* 61.

Obj. 12. *Though 'tis true, when God made a Promise to* Abraham, *to be a God to him and to his Seed*, Gen. 17. 7. *The Seed there mentioned, is by the Apostle applied to Christ*, Gal. 3. 16. He saith not unto Seeds as many, but as of one, and to thy Seed which is Christ; *yet this is not to be understood of Christ Personal, but of Christ Mystical, as in* 1 Cor. 12. 12. *And so 'tis to be understood of the Visible Church, of which Infants Born of Believing Parents are a part.* Answered p. 61 62.

Obj. 13. *In the Commission*, Mat. 28. *The Apostles are commanded* to teach *or disciple* all Nations, Baptizing them: *But Infants are Disciples, and therefore to be Baptized.* Answered. from p. 62 to 65.

Obj. 14. *The Infants of* Believers, *even while they are Infants, are capable of being made Partakers of the Inward Grace of Baptism, as well as grown Men. And therefore they ought to receive the outward Sign of Baptism.* Answered.

swered. p. 65.

Obj. 15. *Our Saviour tells us, that* unto such belongeth the Kingdom of Heaven. *If Children therefore are capable of the greater, then they are capable of the lesser. If capable of a Membership in the Kingdom, then of the Sign and Cognisance thereof. But the first is true,* Ergo *the latter.* Answered. p. 65, 66.

Obj. 16. *The Gospel took place just as the Old Administration did, by bringing in whole Families together. When* Abraham *was taken in, his whole Family was taken in: So in this New Administration; usually if the Master of the House turned Christian, the whole Family came in, and were Baptiz'd with him. The whole Household of* Cornelius, *the first Converted* Gentile. Act. 11. 14. *The Household of* Stephanus. *The Household of* Lydia. *The Household of the Jaylor.* Answered from p. 66. to 69.

Obj. 17. *As there is no Express Command or Example in the Scripture, concerning the Baptism of Infants; So neither is there any concerning the Baptism of Persons at* Age, *whose Parents were Christians when they were Born and who have been educated from their Childhood in the Christian Religion: The Scripture giving no Account of the Baptism of any in the Apostle's days, but such as were Converted from* Judaism, *or* Paganism, *to* Christianity: *And therefore the Baptizing of Infants is as Lawful as the Baptism of such, there being no Express Warrant or Example in the Scripture, for the one more than for the other. And if a just Consequence may be admitted for the proof of the one, why not for the other also? You are wont to reject all Scripture Consequences in Respect of Infants Baptism; and yet here you must of Necessity admit of the same: So that this Argument therefore returns upon your selves.* Answered, *from* p. 69, to 71,

Obj. 18. *Infants were by God's Express Command to be Circumcised under the former Administration; and all God's* Com-

Commands about his Inſtitutions then, (according to the Rule of Analogy or Proportion) are equally binding unto us, as well as to the Jews *then. As in the Caſe of the Chriſtian Sabbath unto us, which the Fourth Commandment binds us, as it did the* Jews *to the former. And thus it is in Reference to Infants Baptiſm. In Reſpect of which, though there is no Expreſs Command to that Purpoſe recorded in the* New Teſtament; *yet we cannot but conclude that God's Command unto the* Jews *to Circumciſe their Infants under the Law, carries with it the force (at leaſt) of a virtual Command unto us to Baptize ours.* Anſwered. p. 71, 72, 73.

Obj. 19. *If the Baptiſm of Believers be the only Baptiſm which Chriſt hath appointed: How comes it to paſs that ſo many Learned and Pious Men ſhould for ſo long a ſeaſon, and throughout ſo many Generations, cleave to Infants Baptiſm, whilſt ſo few in Compariſon do embrace the contrary Practiſe?* Anſwered from p. 73 to 79.

Obj. 20. *The Apoſtle tells us that* neither Circumciſion availeth any thing, nor Uncircumciſion, but a New Creature. *It is our main buiſneſs therefore to preſs after the Power of Godlyneſs; And we are affraid that while there is ſo much ſtreſs laid upon the Circumſtantials of Religion, it tends to the loſing the Subſtance. Beſides having been already Baptized in our Infancy, what Neceſſity is there for the Repetition thereof?* Anſwered, *from* p. 79 to 82.

The Concluſion of the Second Part. 82, 85.

The Third Part.

Containing Some Animadverſions on Mr. Sidenham's *Treatiſe of Baptiſm; Wherein that of Infants is further diſproved. Together, with ſome further Reflections on Mr.* Allen's *forementioned Diſcourſe, to the ſame purpoſe. Whereunto is Annexed an Anſwer at large unto* Mr. Baxter's *chief Argument for the Church-membership of Infants, from the Nature of the Covenant made with* Iſrael *in the Land of* Moab,

Moab. *Mentioned* Deut. 29. *where Children are Represented as fellow Covenanters with their Parents; which (saith he) was a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant. And therefore neither it, nor the Church-membership of Infants which was built thereon, Repealed.*

The Fourth Part.

Wherein the Baptism of Infants is further Disproved; By way of Answer to the Arguments made use of by Dr. Burthogge *and others, for the Support of that Practise. Wherein the Covenant made with* Israel *at Mount Sinai.* Exod. 20. *as also the Covenant of Circumcision made with* Abraham, Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9. (*Whereon so much stress is laid for the Support of Infants Baptism*) *are plainly proved to be no other than two Several Editions of the Covenant of Works. And Consequently that no just Argument can thence be deduced for the Justification of that Practise.*

Together, with a clear and distinct Explanation of the true Nature and Difference between the two Covenants, that of Works, and that of Grace.

The Fifth Part.

Containing a Description of that truly Evangelical Covenant God was pleased to make with Believing Abraham; *wherein lies the Sum of the Everlasting Gospel then Preached unto him; Since Proclaimed by the Apostles; And which now Remains to be yet further Published unto all Nations, for the Obedience of Faith.* Rom. 16. 25. 26. Rev. 14. 6. 7.

Wherein the true Nature and Difference between the two Covenants, that of Works, and that of Grace, is further Explained.

Wherein Mr. Baxters *Argument also concerning the Morality of Infants Church-membership, is duly weighed and Answered.*

The Conclusion; Containing a Solemn Call unto all Gods People Speedily and Seriously to attend unto the Primitive Puritie of the Gospel Doctrine, and Worship.

The

THE FIRST PART.

Containing some Animadversions and Reflections upon a Late Discourse of Mr. William Allen; *Entituled*, A Perswasive to Unity: or, A Serious and Friendly Address to the Nonconformists. *And first in reference to his Arguments against the* Antipædobaptists.

MR. *Allen*'s first Argument is; That a known Anabaptistical Principle Condemns the Practice of Anabaptists themselves. The Principle is; That Christ's Commission is to be Interpreted as to the Extent of it, only by Scripture Examples. And it Condemns the Practice of Anabaptists; because there is no Scripture Example for the Baptizing such Persons as they Baptize, *viz.* those of grown Age whose Parents were Christians, and who have been Educated from their Child-hood in the Christian Religion; but only such as were newly Converted from Paganism or Judaism, to Christianity.

To this we Reply. First, That though it should be granted, that there is no expres Example in the Scripture, concerning the Baptizing Persons at Age, whose Parents were Christians; yet it is sufficient unto us, that there are Examples enough in the Scripture concerning the Baptism of *Believers*: So that let a Person be but a *Believer*, and we have no reason to enquire into his *Pedigree*; nor have we any Rule that so directs us, in Order to his Admission to Baptism.

And as we have no Rule nor Reason to accept of a Person that Believes, the rather because he had Christian Parents; so neither to Reject him on that Ground. Could the like Command or Examples be produced from the Scripture concerning the *Baptism of Infants*, as can easily be produced concerning the *Baptism of Believers*, (for under that Notion only are we bound to take Cognizance of those Baptized by us;) the present Controversie would soon be concluded between us.

Secondly, This Argument will easily fall to the Ground, if we duly consider the Scope of the forementioned Commission concerning Baptism, as it is Recorded. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Go ye therefore and Teach*, or Disciple *all Nations, Baptizing them*, &c. Wherein, as the Order to be observed, is plainly Exclusive of Infants, who are uncapable of Teaching, or Discipleship by Instruction, as the Rule here directs: So it is as evident, that it Includes all other sorts of Persons that are capable of Actual Teaching, whether they be *Jews* or *Gentiles*, or whether they be the Off-spring of Pagans or Believers; there being therein no Exception of any, it extending to all sorts of People in all Nations that are capable of being effectually taught or instructed in the Rudiments of the Christian Doctrine, so as to make an Answerable Profession of the same; which we hope it will not be denied, but that the Off-spring of Christian Parents are as capable of, as others, if not more, by the Advantage of their Education, when coming to years of Understanding, and therefore are plainly included in the Commission concerning Baptism, as well as others; which Infants are not, because uncapable of being taught, as the Commission directs.

But against this it is objected, That if the Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Excludes none from Baptism but such as are to be excluded by the Order therein to be observed: And if Baptizing and Teaching are to precede or follow one the other as there named by Christ: Then these two Conclusions will follow.* First, *That Infants are not there Excluded from Baptism.* Secondly. *That a Person may be Baptized before he is Taught. And that these Propositions do follow from those before mentioned, will appear from that Text in the Original, where, on a little Consideration it may be observed, that the Order so much talk'd of. and which so much stress is laid upon by the* Anabaptists, *is clearly for the* Pædobaptists, *and not for them. We have there First* μαθητευσατε παντα τα ἐθνη *which will be easily allowed to signify, Disciple all Nations, Make them Disciples or Christians. Secondly, we have* βαπτιζοντες, &c. *and* διδασκοντες, &c. *which literally to translate it, Baptizing,——Teaching.* —— *Now then* Discipling *being a general Word, that contains in it the two other that follow,* Baptizing *and* Teaching; *and being the Imparative Mood, whereas the other two are Participles; it is manifest that the whole Command or Commission is given in that, and that the Mode of Execution is expressi'd in these: And*

if

if the Mode of executing that general Commission be expres'd in these where Baptizing is first, and Teaching comes after: What is become of the Order the Antipædobaptists *have so long talked of? Certainly, the insisting on the Order in that place, proves to them an unhappy Weapon to stab that Cause, for the defence of which it hath been brought into the Field.*

For Answer hereunto, we say; That how fatal soever you suppose it may prove to us, or the Cause we plead for, to insist on the Order there mentioned: Of this we are sure, that if we neglect the Order Christ himself hath appointed, we shall come short of pleasing him; and consequently so to Teach, must needs prove an unhappy Weapon to stab that Cause, in the defence of which it is engaged.

In the Scripture before us, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. there are plainly 3 distinct Acts required by Christ, in the Commission he there gave his Apostles. First, *Go Teach*, or Disciple *all Nations*; that is, not by Baptizing them, as the Objection supposeth, and afterward to teach them,; but singly by the Preaching of the Gospel unto them: For so it must of Necessity be understood, as appears by the Parallel Account that is given us of the same Commission. *Mark.* 16. 15. *Go Preach the Gospel to every Creature.* Secondly, to Baptize them. So it follows in *Mathew*, that is; such as shall give a believing Entertainment thereunto: For so it follows in *Mark. He that Believeth and is Baptized shall be saved*: And accordingly, this was the consequent Practice of the Apostles. *Act.* 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thine Heart thou mayst.* Thirdly, To teach them their following Duty; *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*

You tell us indeed "That a Person may be Baptized before he is "Taught, and that if the Mode of executing the general Commission "be expres'd in these, where Baptizing is first, and Teaching comes "after; What is become (say you) of the Order the *Antipædobap-*"*tists* have so long talk'd of? But it may rather be demanded; What then is become of the Order the *Scriptures* have so long spoken of? For if Baptizing is first, as you say, and Teaching comes after, then it will follow that the Apostles understood not their Commission aright; for they always first endeavoured to make Disciples by the Preaching of the Gospel, and then Baptized those that gave a Believing Entertainment thereunto. So did *Philip* to the Eunuch, he first Preached the Gospel to him, and then Baptiz'd him. *Act.* 8. So did *Peter* to *Cornelius*, and the rest with him. *Act.* 10. And so did the same *Peter* to the 3000. *Jews* that were converted by that Gospel Sermon, Recorded *Act.* 2. And accordingly, upon the Profession of their Faith and Repentance, we are told *Vers.* 41. *Then they that gladly Received his Word were Baptized:* And thus runs the whole Current of the Scripture, and no Example to the contrary. But according to your Doctrine, neither *Philip* nor *Peter* did well in Preaching to

them first, and Baptizing them afterward: for (say you) Baptizing is first and Teaching comes after. 'Tis true, there is a sort of Teaching that comes after, as hath been before expres'd: But to say that a Person may be Baptized before he is Taught, is certainly Repugnant to the whole Doctrine and Practice of the Gospel.

And indeed, according to this Reckoning; If a Minister were to be sent into a Foreign Land, among a Company of Ignorant Heathens, to Disciple them to the Practice and Profession of Christianity: His first work must be to take them by the Shoulder, and to lead them into the Water; or at least by Surprize, to sprinkle a little Water upon their Faces: For it may justly be doubted, few would readily submit thereunto; unless they were first Taught, and Instructed in the Mystery of that sacred Institution. And if any should be induced to submit thereunto, without the Precedency of Preparatory Instructions: This Practice you see would be Foreign to the Doctrine and Practice of Christ and his Apostles. And therefore, certainly to insist on such an Order must needs prove an unhappy Weapon, to stab that Cause, in the defence whereof 'tis thus engaged.

The Scripture is indeed full in the Justification of the Order we now plead for, and to affirm the contrary, carries with it no small Absurdity. *Go Teach*, or Disciple *all Nations* (saith Christ to his Apostles) that is, according to the scope of the fore-mentioned Objection, Baptize them first, and Teach them afterward, this being the mode of executing that General Commission: But is the *Opus Operatum* of Baptism, think you, a likely way or means to beget or bring forth Disciples unto Christ? If Men be Preach'd by the Gospel into Discipleship, it is no wonder, *For it is the Wisdom of God, and the Power of God unto Salvation, unto every one that believeth.* 1 *Cor.* 1. 21. 24. And accordingly where the Spirits Energy doth accompany it, it Disciples Men into the very Life and Spirit of Christianity. But we never read that Baptism was ever appointed for that end, whether by it self, or in Conjunction with Preaching. It follows after, 'tis true, but not to make us Disciples, but to shew that we are such, as a visible Mark to this purpose to be taken on us. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27.

If you say that Baptism is not sufficient to make a Disciple or Christian, without the after-Teaching; How comes it then to pass that Infants are Baptized, who are uncapable of the after-Teaching you speak of? Many of whom, also dye in their Infancy, and so are never Taught, whether before or after: Of whom nevertheless it is affirmed, that *the Baptized Infant is Regenerate, received into the Number of the Children of God, and an Heir of Everlasting Life.* And hence it is that the Baptism of Infants is commonly called the *Christening* of them; that is, they are thereby made Christians. So that though you seem to allow the Necessity of joyning Instruction with Baptism to make a

Disciple

ple or Christian; yet the common Practice shews that Baptism alone is reckoned sufficient for that Purpose.

But (say you) "These two Conclusions do plainly flow from the "Premises. *First*, that Infants are not there excluded from Baptism. "*Secondly*, That a Person may be Baptized before he is Taught. For Answer, you see we have plainly proved to you, from the constant Doctrine and Practice of Christ and his Apostles, that none ought to be Baptized before they are Taught. And then it will equally follow, and that with the same Clearness, that Infants are there excluded from Baptism, because uncapable after an ordinary rate of being taught as the Gospel directs.

So that you see, the whole of your Argument falls to the ground. You may Criticize therefore at Pleasure, and talk what you will of *Imparative Moods*, and *Participles*: You see we have diligently considered the general Scope of the Commission, by comparing *Mathew* and *Mark* together, and the consequent Practice of the Apostles thereon, who were best able to understand the meaning of it; wherein we have plainly proved to you the Antecedency of Teaching or Preaching to Baptism: And therefore, unless you can produce another Commission for the Baptism of Infants, who are uncapable of being thus Taught, all you can say besides will avail you nothing.

Mr. *Allen*'s Second Argument is derived from those Words of our Saviour. *Mat.* 19. 14. *Suffer Little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* From whence it is Inferred, that if little Children are capable of a Membership in the Kingdom, from the gracious Respect Christ bears unto them, then they are equally capable of the Sign or Cognizance thereof, which is, Baptism:

For Answer, *First*, it must be considered, that it remains as yet unproved, that the little Children here spoken of were *Infants*; the Context both here and elsewhere giving shrewd ground of Conjecture, that they were rather such little Children as were capable of making an *Actual Profession of their Faith in Christ*; which seems to be intimated by our Saviour. *Mat.* 18. 2. When having called a little Child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, he saith, *Ver.* 6. *Whoso shall offend one of these little Ones that believe in me*, &c. Which after an ordinary rate cannot with any shadow of pretence, be intended of *Young Sucking Infants*: For *Faith cometh by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God*; which such little Children, according to an ordinary Reckoning, are utterly uncapable of. Nor doth the Greek Word used *Luke* 18. 15. Which is translated in English, *Infants*, prove it: For the Greek Word which is there translated, *Infants*, as *Piscator* himself tells us; signifies a *Child capable of Teaching*: As when it is said, *Timothy knew the Sacred Scriptures from a Child*; that is, ever

 since

since he was a *Boy*, not an *Infant*; it being the same Greek Word that is used in both places. It is an ungrounded Supposition therefore, that these were sucking *Infants* of whom Christ here speaketh; which till it can be proved, the Inference that is hence drawn, concerning the Baptizing of such, must needs be acknowledged to have a very infirm and slender bottom.

Secondly, Though it should be granted that they were indeed *Young Infants*, that are here spoken of, as such unto whom *belongeth the Kingdom of Heaven*: It may be (as *Piscator* also observes) referred not to their present state, as if for the present they were in the Kingdom of God, that is, Believers, and Justified; but that they were Elect Persons, and so in time, of them should be the Kingdom of God. Now that which gives right to Baptism, is the present state of a Person. And

Thirdly, It ought also to be duly considered; that the little Children here spoken of, whatever they were, are expresly ordered to be brought unto *Christ*, who *himself Baptized not*, and not unto his *Disciples*, whose proper Work that was: Nor is there any mention made at all of their *Baptizing*; but his *laying his Hands upon them and blessing them*. And from the Action of Christs blessing them, to infer that they are to be *Baptized*, proves nothing so much as that there is a want of better Arguments: For the Conclusion would with more probability be derived thus. Christ blessed Children, and so dismissed them, but Baptized them not; therefore Infants are not to be Baptized. But let this Argument be as weak as its Fellow; sure we are that Christ hath other ways of bringing them to Heaven, than by Baptism. And as we are sure that God hath not commanded Infants to be Baptized; So we are sure God will do them no Injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help, *viz.* If the Parents Baptize them not. Many Thousand ways there are by which God can bring any reasonable Soul unto him; but nothing is more unreasonable, than because he hath tied all Men of Years and Discretion to this way, therefore we of our own Heads shall carry Infants to him that way, without his Direction. So to conceive is groundless, and the Action consequent to it is too bold and venturous. Let him do what he pleases with our Infants, we must not.

But it is Objected, That as it cannot be denied, but that it is our Duty to bring our Children unto Christ in the Arms of Faith and Prayer, (at least,) in order to their receiving the Holy Spirit; so we are assured, that in all the things *that we ask of him according to his Will he heareth us*: And if so, *who can forbid Water that these should not be Baptized that have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?* Act. 10. 47.

To

To this we Reply, That though it is indeed our Duty to be Wrestling with God for our selves, our Children, and others also, in Order to our obtaining the blessings of the Holy Spirit, for our selves and them; yet we have no ground certainly to conclude that God heareth our Prayers in this respect, for *others than our selves*. Of this we are assured, that if we sincerely desire it for *our selves*, God will not deny us the same; having to this purpose given us his most faithful Promise, *That he will give the Holy Spirit unto them that ask him*, Luk. 11. 13. But we have not the same Assurance in respect of *others*; the Promise being only to those that ask it for *themselves*: He saith not, that he will give the Holy Spirit to them that *ask him not*, or that *desire not the Knowledge of his Ways*. True it is, that God is found sometimes of them that do *not seek him*, and he may accordingly give the Holy Spirit to them that do *not desire him*, when so it pleaseth him: But he hath no where *bound* himself so to do. What he *may do* is *one thing*, and what he hath *promised* is *another*; and 'tis God's *Promise* only that we are to build upon in this respect. 'Tis true, we are to ask Gods Spirit, as for *our selves*, so for *others* also, that *if peradventure* they may receive the same benefit with *our selves*: And much more are we bound to become Petitioners to Heaven for our *Children* upon that Account: But till they are able to give some Convincing Evidence that our Prayers are *heard*, we have no just Reason to conclude that they are *actually possest* of so rich a Benefit, there being no Promise giving us Assurance to this purpose.

As for that Promise, *Isa.* 59. 21. which is mentioned by Mr. *Allen*, upon this Account; It cannot without palpable straining be applyed to the *Natural Off-spring* of Believers, now as he supposeth: It having a most plain and absolute Reference to the *Redeemer*, spoken of in the foregoing *Verse*, and can be applyed unto none other than unto *him*, and *his Spiritual Seed*; and that at the time of his second Appearance according to *Rom.* 26. 27. Out of whose Mouth, God there Promiseth, *That his Spirit should never depart, nor out of the Mouth of his Seed, nor out of the Mouth of his Seeds Seed for ever*. Indeed, If God's Holy Spirit were absolutely and everlastingly entailed upon all the *Natural Off-spring of Believers*; now, as our Opponents from this Scripture do affirm it is; this would be comfortable Tydings indeed, could it be substantially proved unto us: But alas! As the present Scripture proves it not, so neither doth any other that we know of; and were it so that God had any where promised, that at the Request of the Believing Parents he, would not fail to give his Holy Spirit unto all their *Natural Seed*: No doubt, *Noah*, *Abraham* and *David*, with many other choice Believers, recorded in the Scripture, were not defective in their Duty, to be wrestling with God for their *Off-spring* in this Respect, that they *all* might be Partakers of his Holy Spirit, and consequently

that they *all* might be made Inheritours of the Heavenly Kingdom, (For the Holy Spirit once given, as the Scripture before alledged, proves, was *never more to depart from them*.) But alas! Most evident it is, that notwithstanding their most Zealous Prayers, and other Pious endeavours, for the Spiritual benefit of their *Natural Off-spring*; they had many of them such *Children*, as were very Wicked, Flagitious and Prophane, and such as were *rejected by God*; which yet they had not been, had they been at all possessed of Gods *Holy Spirit*, as the Fruit of their Parents Prayers and Supplications to God for them. And to this doth the dayly Experience that occurs to our own Observation, very sadly testify.

The Sum then of our Answer to the forementioned Objection, is this; They that have *Received the Holy Ghost*, or such at least, concerning whom there is any convincing Evidence thereof (as was the Case of them in the 10. *Act.* of whom this word was spoken) such are the proper Subjects of *Baptism*. For *who can forbid Water that such should not be Baptized?* But till there can be convincing Evidence given concerning our Children, that either all or any of them are actually partakers thereof; according to this Rule, they are not the *proper Subjects* of *Baptism*: And therefore till then they are not to be *Baptized*.

As for Mr. *Allen*'s Third Argument, drawn from *Rom.* 11. 17. We say that that Scripture is by him and others impertinently alledged to this purpose: It being to be understood not of ingrafting into the *visible Church* by an outward Ordinance, as Baptism; but into the *Invisible* by Election, and giving of Faith, as the whole Chapter shews.

His Fourth Argument is drawn from. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *For the Unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the Wife, and the Unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Husband, else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy*; from whence he would infer, that the Children of Believers are Holy with a *federal* or Covenant Holiness, and therefore to be Baptized.

To this we Reply; That the same sort of *Holiness* is ascribed to the *Children*, as is to be understood in reference to the *Unbelieving Husband*, or the *Unbelieving Wife*, who are both here said to be *Sanctified* by their Respective Yoak-Fellows; which cannot be understood of a *Federal* or *Covenant Holyness*, but that which is *Matrimonial*: For if we must understand it of a *Covenant Holyness*, then it will follow that the *Unbelieving Wife*, or the *Unbelieving Husband*, may upon the same ground lay claim to *Baptism* as well as their *Children*; which yet your selves will not grant. Besides, it is evident from the Words themselves, in which the term *Believer* is omitted, which would not be, if the *Holiness* were derived from the *Faith* of the one Party, and so to be understood of a *Covenant Holiness*. And the single terms of *Husband* and *Wife* are twice used, which shews that the Holiness is from the *Conjugal Relation*, and cannot be meant of any other than *Legitimation*. And the term *Unbe-*

liever

Never is also twice used, and said to be *Sanctified*; which can have no other sence but this, That the *Unbelieving* Yoke-fellow is *Sanctified* in respect of *Conjugal Use* to his or her Yoke-fellow; and so though the one be an *Unbeliever*, they might comfortably enough live together in *Lawful* Wedlock. For else, saith he, your Children were to be accounted *Unclean*, that is *Illegitimate*: But this being determined, that the Husband is thus *Sanctified* to the Wife, and the Wife to the Husband, though the one be an *Unbeliever*, hence it follows that your *Children are Holy*, that is, *Lawfully begotten*, which is the only sence apposite to the Determination. *verse* 12. 13. And as for the use of the Word *Holy* for *Legitimate*, that it is in this Sence used elsewhere in the Scripture is evident from *Mal.* 2. 15. Where a *Seed of God* can be understood in no other sence than that of a *Lawful Seed* in Opposition to those born by *Polygamy*.

But though it should be allowed that the *Holiness* in the Text is indeed to be understood of a *Federal* or *Covenant Holiness*; yet we cannot therefore grant, That that is a sufficient Reason for the Baptism of *Infants*: For let the *Holiness* in the Text be what it will, whether *Moral*, *Federal*, or *Matrimonial*, neither of these is either there, or elsewhere assigned to be a *Ground* of Baptizing Children upon; that which is laid down in the *Institution* being that alone that can *Warrant* the same. It is *God's Word* only, not *our Reason* that can Justifie *our Practice* in *God's Ordinances*. That a *Profession of Faith and Repentance* is a Substantial Warrant for *Baptism*, is undeniable to be proved from the *Scriptures*: But that so is *Federal Holiness*, or any other *Indiscernable Qualification* in Infants; the Scripture is altogether silent therein.

His Fifth Argument for Infants Baptism, is derived from *Acts* 2. 38, 39. *Repent and be Baptized every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of Sins*, &c. *For the Promise is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall Call.*

But whatever Mr. *Allen* or others suppose, First it is Evident that the *Promise* here spoken of, is not to be understood of a Promise of *External* Priviledges, but the *Promise of the Gospel*, or *the Grace of God in Christ Jesus*, which was now freely held forth unto them upon their Repentance, notwithstanding they had been the Actual Murderers of the *Lord of Glory*, which he had before charged upon them; which only could be a *Suitable Plaister* for the *Wound* now given them thereby; telling them that they might have *Remission of Sins*, even of that Sin, if they did *Repent*: Because, beyond and contrary to their Acting, in Crucifying Christ, God had brought to pass the raising up of Christ for their Salvation, and *their Children, and all*

whom

whom God should Call, though a far off, if they also did Repent, and were Baptized into the Name of Christ.

Nor indeed, Secondly, was the Promise to their Children, as *Believers Seed*; nor to them or any other *uncalled* by the Lord; But with this express Proviso; *Even as many as the Lord our God shall Call.* Which calling alone made them Christs, and capable of Baptism. Nor are the Words, *To you and your Children*, mentioned as an acknowledgment of a Priviledge to them *before others*; but by reason of their Wish. *Mat.* 27. 25. *His Blood be on us, and on our Children:* And so as a Remedy of their Perplexity, v. 37. *When they heard this they were pricked to their Heart*, &c. Nor is any Intimation given of a Title *Baptism* to them, or their Children *as the Children of Believers*, but an Exhortation to them and theirs to Repent and be Baptized, as their *duty* for their benefit; The Promise being not mentioned, as though *of it self* it gave a *Title* to Baptism, either to them, or to their Off-spring, without *Repentance:* But as a *Motive* why both they and theirs should actually Repent, and be Baptised; because in so doing they would be in the way of obtaining the *Remission of their Sins*, and *Receiving the Holy Ghost*, the two grand Branches of the Promise here mentioned: Which duty of *Repentance*, Little Children being uncapable of performing, neither are they therefore, according to this direction of the Apostle, the *proper Subiects* of such an Ordinance. So that this Text is grosly abused by such as infer from thence, a Title to Baptism for the *Children* of Believers, by vertue of a Promise to them, *as such*; Whereas it is manifest from the whole Scope of the Con-text; that it is only an Encouragement to the Jews against *Despair*, by reason of their Crucifying of Christ; Letting them know, that yet there was hope of Mercy and of Pardon for *them*, and *theirs*, upon the Respective Repentance of *either* of them.

A Sixth Argument for Infants Baptism is drawn from *Col.* 2. 11. *In whom also you are Circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh by the Circumcision of Christ.* Ver. 12. *Buried with him in Baptism, wherein you are also risen with him, through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead.* From whence a groundless Inference is drawn, concerning the Succession of Christian *Baptism*, into the Room, Place, and Use of Jewish *Circumcision.* And that therefore, as the Jewish Infants were *Circumcised*, so by way of *Analogy*, those Born of Christian Parents ought to be *Baptised.*

To this We Answer; First, That to suppose that *Christian Baptism* comes in the Room, Place, or Use of *Jewish Circumcision*, is a mistaken Inference, which can neither be truly drawn from those Words of the Apostle to the *Colossians*, nor from any other place of Scripture.

Not

Not from the present Words, where no Circumsion *in the Flesh* is at all *Expressed*, or can be *meant*, but that of *Christ's* in his own *Person*; which is there made the Exemplary Effecient of *Spiritual Circumcision*: for so it is expresly told us. *In whom also you are Circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ.* So that this Text avails nothing at all to the present purpose; it being evident that the Scope of the Spirit of God there, is to shew that *we are compleat in Christ*, v. 10. And to this purpose he Subjoyns. v. 12. *Buried with Him in Baptism, wherein ye are also risen with Him, through the Faith of the Operation of God.* But whereas we are told that the Jewish Teachers would be ready to Object, that the receiving of the *Inward Grace* of Circumcision did not make them so compleat as *Abraham* and his Seed was, because they had also an *Outward Visible Sign*. This is a groundless Conceit that either the Jews were ready thus to *Object*, or that the Apostle intended to *Answer* such an Objection: But supposing it were so, Doth it therefore follow that because the *Jewish Infants* were Circumcised, therefore *ours* must be Baptized? Is there a Syllable of that sound or signification in the Text? For it is plain that the Apostle is not there speaking of *Infants*, but concerning *Adult Believers* only; nor can it with any shadow of Reason be affirmed that *Baptism* is appointed to have the same Place, and Use in the Church of God that *Circumcision* had: For if so then it would also follow, that *Females* must be Excluded from *Baptism*, because uncapable of *Circumcision*. And that because Circumcision bound Men to keep the whole Ceremonial Law of *Moses*; therefore so doth Baptism also. And indeed, to affirm that there is the same Ground for Infant Baptism, as for Infant Circumcision, is to assert that the command of Circumcision is Obligatory to us. And to Imagine that there is a Parity of Reason from *Analogy* or *Proportion* between them, is no other than a groundless Supposition, that there is a Reason of them to direct us in their Use, besides what God hath *expresly declard unto us*; and to say, That tho Christ and His Apostles have not *told* us so; yet we *think* it should be so, is to Impute *a defect* in them of what they *should* have done, and more *Wisdom* and *Diligence* in our selves about Ordering the Divine Service.

We can fetch (saith Mr. *Baxter* in his late *Treatise* of *Episcopacy*) *no Model of a Gospel Ministry, nor proof of our Authority or Obligation as Instituted, from the Instituted Ministry of the Mosaical Church: Because the Law of* Moses *is Abrogate, and indeed did never bind the Gentiles. Nor is it safe* (saith he) *to Argue from Parity of Reason, that we must now be, or do, as they did, in point of pure Institution, while we so little know the total Reason of God's Institutions. And when He Himself hath taken them*

them down and set up new Ones, we must not then plead our Reason against the Alterations which God Himself hath made. P. 29. Besides which.

Secondly, The Argument from *Circumcision* is invalid upon many Considerations; For Figures and Types prove nothing, unless a *Command* go a long with them, or some *Express* to signifie such to be their purpose: For the Deluge of Waters, and the Ark of *Noah*, were a Figure of Baptism, said *Peter*: And if the Circumstances of the one should be drawn to the other, we should make Baptism a *Prodigy* rather than a *Rite*. The Feast of the *Passover* was a Type of the *Supper*, which succeeds the other as much as *Baptism* doth to *Circumcision*: But because there was in the eating of the *Paschal Lamb*, no prescription of *Sacramental Drink*, shall we thence Conclude, that the Supper is to be Administred but in *one kind*? Or, that because the *Passover* was to be eaten in *haste*, with a Staff in their Hand; Must we thence conclude, that the *Lords Supper* ought to be so Celebrated also? No, we will easily conclude that we are duly to attend unto the Words of the Institution, which particularly concerns the right Celebration of that Ordinance of the *Supper*, whatever Circumstances were by the command of God to be Observed in the Celebration of the *Type*. And after the same sort must we Reason, if we will Reason aright, concerning *Circumcision* and *Baptism* also. And yet again,

Thirdly, Even in the very Instance of this Argument; Supposing a Correspondency of *Analogy*, between Circumcision and Baptism; yet there is no Correspondency of *Identity*. For although it were granted that both of them did Consign the *Covenant of Faith*; yet there is nothing in the *Circumstance* of Childrens being Circumcised, that so concerns that Mystery, but that it might very well be given to *Children*, and yet Baptism only to *men of Reason*: Because Circumcision *left* a character in the *flesh*, which being Imprinted upon *Infants*, did its work to them when they came of *Age*. And such a Character was necessary, because there was no *word* added to the sign: But Baptism Imprints nothing that remains on the Body, and if it leaves a character at all, it is upon the *Soul*, to which also the *word* is added, which is as much a part of the Ordinance as the *Sign* it self. For which cause therefore it is highly requisite that the Parties Baptized should be *capable of Reason*, that they may be capable both of the *word of the Ordinance*, and the *Impress* to be made thereby upon the *Soul*. Since therefore the *Reason* of the Parity doth wholly fail, there is left nothing to Infer a Necessity of Complying in this Circumstance of *Age* more then in the other *Annexes* of the Type. Then also the Infant must be precisely baptized upon the *Eighth day*; And *Females* must not be baptized, because such were not to be Circumcised. But it were more proper if we would understand it aright, to

pro-

prosecute the Analogy from the *type* to the Antitype, by way of *letter* and *Spirit* and *Signification*. That as Circumcision figures Baptism; so also the Adjuncts of the Circumcision, shall signifie some thing *Spiritual*, in the *Adherences* of Baptism. And therefore as *Infants* were Circumcised; So *Spiritual* Infants shall be Baptized, which is Spiritual Circumcision. For therefore *Babes* had the Ministry of the *type*, to Signifie that we must, when we give our Names to Christ, become *Children in Malice*, and then the type is made Compleat.

The Seventh Argument for Infants Baptism, and whereon the greatest stress is laid, by Mr *Allen*, Mr *Baxter*, and others; is drawn from the *Church-member-ship of Infants* under the former Administration. That because Infants were comprehended with their Parents in the *Jews Church* state; they are so still under the *Gospel*, and therefore to *be* baptized.

Reply. We know very well that Mr. *Baxter* and others, do Assert the Church-membership of Infants *before Abrahams time*; and that therefore it is a *Moral* Institution, and so not Capable of being *Repealed* as other Jewish Rites were. But that is a *groundless Fiction*, and cannot be at all proved from the Scripture: The Discussion whereof shall be reserved for the latter part of this Discourse. In the mean season, That they were admitted Members of the *Jewish Church* is Evident. And it is also as Evident that God hath now quite pulled down *that House* of his, broke up House-keeping, and turned the Servants, Infants, and all out of Doors. Rom. 11. 17. 24. *The Natural Branches are broken of*, and God hath now built him a New house into which God hath admitted none as his Houshold Servants but *Believers* only, or such as *Profess* so to be. *Moses* saith the Apostle, *Heb.* 3. 5. 9. *was faithfull as a Servant in all his house: But Christ as a Son over his own House: Whose House are we, if we hold fast the Confidence, &c.* Where the Servants of the new house, are discribed to be *Beleivers, not Infants*, and therefore called *Living Stones and a Spiritual House*. 1. *Pet.* 2. 3. And that the Old House, the Jewish Church, with all the Appurtenances and Priviledges of it, is pulled down, and a new One Built, into which Infants are not to be admitted, is Evident from the Apostles Reasoning. *Heb.* 7. 12. *For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law.* Which must needs Include Circumcision with all the Appurtenances and Priviledges belonging to it. And therefore, as Infants Church-membership *came in* with the Law of Circumcision, So it *went out* and was repealed with it. They *were* tis true of the Houshold *of Old*, but it was by a *positive Law*. Shew us the like *now*, or you say nothing? Sure it is, There is now no Institution that makes Infants *fellow Citizens with the Saints, and of the Houshold of God*, neither are they to bo so accounted till they *believe* and are able

able to do *Service* in the House. And if you say, that among men Infants are counted of the Houshold tho they can do no Service: we Answer; that as Comparisons do not run upon four feet; so it doth not follow that because we count our Infants of our Family, therefore they are to be accounted members of Gods Family, the Gospel Church, unless God by any Institution had made them so. The Houshold of God is called the *Houshold of faith*, or a House Consisting of *Believers*. Now unless you can prove Infants to be *Believers*, they are not of this House: For all the Servants here must be Believers; either *Really*, or at least *historically* and *Professedly*, which Infants cannot be.

If it be Objected, That as the Jews and their Children are broken off: So the Gentiles and their Children are Ingrafted in their Room, according to Rom. 11. 20. *Because of unbelief they were broken off; and thou standest by faith.*

We Answer, That the Reason why the Jews and their Children were broken off, was not because they had not *Believing Parents*: For *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* were *still* the Parents of them all. They were *Abraham's* seed when they were broken off) as well as before: But the true Reason was because the terms of standing in the Church were now *altered*. For before the Gospel came, they stood *members* of the Old *Jewish* Church, though as much *unbelievers*, for many Generations, as they were when they were broken off. But now *Abraham's* Church state is at an end, and all the Priviledges and Immunities cease. The Jewish Church must give way to the Gospel Church; The Messiah being come, and about to build him a New House, into which none are of Right to enter, but such as are *profest Believers:* For the Old House or Jewish Church was not intended to abide *for ever*, but only to the time of *Reformation*. And then the *Law* must be changed, the *Priesthood* changed, the *Priviledges* and *Ordinances* changed, yea the *Covenant* changed: Which they not believing, being willing to abide in the Old House still, and to remain Church Members upon the account of a meer *Fleshly* and *Natural Birth*, still crying out, *Abraham is our Father, and we are his Seed*, and are *Free, and were never in Bondage*: Wherefore they were broken off, and that whether they would or not, by reason of their *unbelief*, that is, because they would not believe that the Old Covenant, and all the Priviledges thereof were *ended*, and the Substance come, the Lord Jesus, who was the true *Antitype*, and *Substance* of all these Shadows. So that thus then, the Jews were then broken off by *Unbelief*; And thou and thine (O! Gentile Believer) must *stand by Faith:* Mark it, thou standest by Faith; not by Virtue of any *Birth Priviledge* whatsoever, but thy standing is by *Faith*; yet not thy Seed by *thy* Faith, but thou thy

self

self by *thine*, and they by their *own*. *Faith* is that by which (thou standing and not thy Seed) hast right to stand in the Church, and not they. But if thy Seed have Faith, and thou hast none, they have right to stand in the Church, and thou shalt be Excluded.

Most certain it is, that under the Law the Natural Seed or Progeny of *Abraham* were all Holy, with an External, Ceremonial, or Typical Holiness, and consequently they were then all admitted to an External Participation of Church Privileges. But remarkable to this purpose is that passage of the Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 5. 16. *Wherefore henceforth know we no Man after the Flesh.* It seems then, that heretofore, there had been a *knowledge* taken of Persons after the *Flesh*. And 'tis plain there was, that because the Jews were of the *Natural* or *Fleshly* Seed of *Abraham*, they were therefore all of them admitted to the Priviledge of an *External* Church-membership, while others were Exempted. But we see the Apostle resolves *henceforth* to disclaim any such *Cognisance* of them, or any others, upon the Account of a meer *Fleshly* Descent. And to this very purpose immediately subjoins in the following Verse. *Therefore if any Man be in Christ he is a new Creature: Old things are past away, all things are become New:* A new Church State, and new Ordinances, a new Seed. and a new way of Introduction, unto the Participation of the Priviledge of Church-membership under the Gospel Dispensation. Now nothing but a *New Creature* will serve the turn; for God expects that they that Worship him now, do *Worship Him in Spirit and in Truth*; The *Priviledge* of being admitted into God's House, and to stand before His Presence in the Actual Celebration of Gospel Ordinances, being now Entailed only upon the Spiritual Seed, even such who *as lively Stones are built up a Spiritual House, a Holy Priesthood to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ.* 1. Pet. 2. 3. 4. Or such at least as make a visible Profession thereof.

And therefore, when this New, and more Spiritual Dispensation was now about actually to be Introduced into the World; *John*, who was the Harbinger of it, gives sufficient notice thereof, and to this purpose deals plainly with the Jews, the Pharisees and the Sadduces that came to be Baptized of him; And tells them upon this Account, *Mat.* 3. 9. *Think not to say within your Selves, We have Abraham to our Father: For I say unto you that God is able of these Stones to raise up Children unto* Abraham. *And now also the Axe is laid unto the Root of the Trees; therefore every Tree that bringeth not forth good Fruit, is hewn down and cast into the Fire.* It cannot be denied but that they had *Abraham* to their Father as much now as before; only the *terms* of their standing in the Church were *now changed*: So that now *every Tree* of whatsoever Natural Stock, or External Production,

that

that bringeth not forth good Fruit must be hewn down. And the Reason is rendered for that *Now the Ax is laid unto the Root of the Trees.* Mark it, [*Now*]'tis so; It was not so *before.* The Ax was never 'till *now* laid at the *Root* of the Trees; which must needs be understood in reference to that *Birth Priviledge* before spoken of, which they had so long boasted of, as the whole Context shews. But now God is resolved to make other manner of Work of it, under the Gospel Dispensation than he did before. Now the *Root of the Trees* must be levelled at. A bare *natural* Descent, or Extraction from a *Religious Root*, will not now serve turn, as in times past it did, to give any right or title to *Church Priviledges.*

Whereas therefore Mr. *Allen* doth endeavour to demonstrate that the Jewish Church was as Pure and Spiritual in its Frame and Constitution as that of the Gospel, it doth from hence most plainly appear that there is a vast difference between them, in respect of the manner of their Constitution, or the terms upon which the Members of either were to be admitted. And as there is no particular Person in the World, whether before or since, that can pretend unto the like *Privilledge*, or Prerogative as *Abraham* had, to be *the Father of the Faithful*; whose *Natural Seed also* were dignified with many *External* Priviledges: So the Dispensation being now *changed*, and the Priviledges that *once* belonged unto *Abraham's Natural Seed* being now *Repealed*, or rather expired; There is therefore no just claim that hence-forth can be duly made unto any other of a like signification under the Gospel, by the *Natural Posterity* of any Believer whatsoever, but such alone as are found actually bearing and bringing forth the same Fruits of Faith and Holiness that *Abraham* did, or such at least as make a *visible Profession* of the same.

As for the latter part of Mr *Allen's* Discourse, Wherein he labours to prove the Lawfulness of *Imposing* other Ceremonies in the Management of God's Worship, beside what himself hath appointed. In order to the Refutation of this Assertion of his, there needs no more to be done than attentively to give heed unto the Words of the Commission given by Christ to his Apostles, and in them, unto all true Church Guides, or Governours unto the end of the World; to this purpose; as it is Recorded. *Mat.* 28. 19. 20. *Go Teach all Nations. &c. Teaching them to Observe all things whatsoever I have Commanded you, and lo I am with you alway, &c.* Where we are to Note, that he saith not that they should teach them to Observe all things in the matters of his Worship which the *Church Governours should hereafter Judge Decent or Convenient:* But *whatsoever I have Comanded*, that is either by himself or his Apostles. Which words must of necessity be Exclusive of all *humane Inventions*, or Additions to the Worship of God; For that he hath frequently discovered his severest Displea-

sure

ſure againſt his People of Old, for their Preſumption in *adding* thoſe things to His Worſhip which He *Commanded not*. A Lively Inſtance whereof we have in the Caſe of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, in their Offering up of *ſtrange Fire*, *Lev.* 10. 1, 2, 3, The Puniſhment Inflicted on whom was not for doing what was *Expreſly forbidden*; but for their *Preſumption* in doing that which God had *not Commanded*. In Matters purely *Civil*, 'tis true, We are to *Submit to Every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's Sake*; and that even in ſuch things as are *not expreſly Commanded*, provided they be not ſome way or other *forbidden* in the Word. But as for the matters of *God's Worſhip*, We have no ſuch Rule, but rather the contrary: *Render therefore to* Cæſar *the things which are* Cæſar's; *and unto* GOD, *the things that are* GOD's. Mat. 22. 21. God having above all things expreſſed His Jealouſie concerning the ſame, and hath frequently given Teſtimonies of his ſevereſt Diſpleaſure againſt His People becauſe of their *Preſumptuous Additions* thereunto. Witneſs. *Deut.* 12. 32. and 18. 20. *Prov.* 30. 6. *Ezek.* 43. 8. *Mat.* 15. 9. *Exod.* 39. 43. And among the reſt to this purpoſe; Remarkable is that Reprehenſion given by our Saviour unto the Scribes and Phariſees; when he tells them that their Worſhip of this kind was but *vain Worſhip*. *Mark* 7. 7. 8. *Howbeit, in vain do they Worſhip me, Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. For laying aſide the Commandment of God, ye hold the Tradition of Men, as the waſhing of Pots and Cups; and many other ſuch like things yee do. And he ſaid unto them,* ver. 9. *Full well ye reject the Commandment of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition.*

Neither indeed is there any Power on Earth that hath Authority ſufficient to *Innovate*, or *Inſtitute* any thing in the Worſhip of God; the higheſt Government that Chriſt hath ordained in His Church being but of a *Subordinate* and *Miniſterial* Property; and therefore not *Abſolute*, but *limited* in its Commands by *the Word of God*. Deut. 12. 32. *Whatſoever I command you, Obſerve to do it, thou ſhalt not add thereunto nor diminiſh from it*. Deut. 18. 20. *The Prophet that ſhall ſpeak a Word in my Name, that I have not commanded, even that Prophet ſhall Dye*. Ezek. 43. 7, 8. *Son of Man, the place of my Throne, and the place of the Soles of my Feet, where I will dwell in the midſt of the Children of* Iſrael *for ever; and my Holy Name ſhall the Houſe of* Iſrael *no more defile, neither they nor their Kings, by their Whoredom, nor by the Carkaſes of their Kings in their high Places; In their ſetting of their Threſhold by my Threſholds, and their Poſt by my Poſts*. In the Work of the Tabernacle of Old nothing was to be *Superadded*, but what God had *Expreſsly appointed*. Exod. 39. 43. And the Reaſon is the ſame in the Goſpel Miniſtration.

But by way of Opposition hereunto, is that general direction of the Apostle urged, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. *Let all things be done decently and in order.* From whence it is Inferred that whatsoever Church Governours shall *Judge decent* and *orderly* in God's Worship, ought to be submitted unto.

We Answer, That this cannot be justly Inferred from these Words for the following Reasons.

For *First*, To Worship GOD in a way that is *not decent* and *orderly* according to *Scripture Rule*, is manifestly our Sin. 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. But to Worship Him in the use of those enjoyned Ceremonies, is to Worship Him in a way *not decent* and *orderly* according to *Scripture Rule*, Therefore so to do would be manifestly our Sin.

The *Major* is proved; the *Minor* is thus proved.

If to Worship GOD in the use of such Ceremonies be decent and orderly according to *Scripture Rule*; then to Worship Him *without* such Ceremonies is *not* to Worship GOD *decently* and *orderly*, according to *Scripture Rule*: For one Rule cannot make the same Worship, decent and undecent, orderly and disorderly.

But to Worship Him *without* the use of these Ceremonies is to Worship Him *decently* and *orderly*, according to *Scripture Rule*; the Apostles and Primitive Christians Worshiping Him decently and orderly without them; *Ergo*, &c.

Second Argument.

To part with our *Christian Liberty* purchased for us by the Blood of CHRIST, is our Sin. But to submit unto the *Injunction* of such *Indifferent* things, is to part with our *Christian Liberty*. Therefore so to do is our Sin.

The *Major* is undeniable, from *Gal.* 5. 1. *Stand fast therefore in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us Free; and be not intangled again with the Yoke of Bondage.*

The *Minor* is Evident from Scripture. 1 *Cor.* 7. 23. *Ye are Bought with a Price, be not ye the Servants of Men.* And from Reason: For all Actions fall into these three Classes, *viz.* Things *Commanded*, Things *Forbidden*, and Things *Indifferent*. In the two *former* we have *no Liberty*; it remains therefore our *Liberty* must consist wholly in the *Latter*, and to submit to the *Injunction* of those things as *necessary*, is to part with *that*, and consequently with all our *Liberty*; which would therefore be our Sin.

Third

Third Argument.

To Derogate from *Christs* Honour and Royal Authority is manifestly our Sin. But to submit to the *Imposition* of unnecessary *Rites* in the Worship of God by the *Authority of Man*, is to derogate from the Honour and Royal Authority of *Christ*: Therefore to submit to their Imposition is Sin.

The *Minor* only needing Proof hath it abundantly, from all those Scriptures that Assert Christ to be the only Lord and Lawgiver to His Church. *Mat.* 23. 8. *Be ye not called* Rabbi: *For One is your Master, even Christ.* Jam. 4. 12. *There is One Lawgiver who is able to Save and to Destroy.* And all those Scriptures that Assert the Plenitude and Perfection of His Laws for Government. *Heb.* 3. 5, 6. Moses *verily was Faithful in all his House as a Servant: But Christ as a Son over His own House*, &c. 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of GOD, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness: That the Man of GOD may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good Works.* And by all those Scriptures which Condemn the Observance of any Religious Rites, Imposed by any other Authority. 2 *Col.* 21, 22, 23. *Touch not, Taste not, Handle not; which all are to Perish with the using, after the Commandments and Doctrines of Men. Which things have indeed a shew of Will-worship and Humility*, &c. Mark, 7. 7. *For laying aside the Commandment of God, ye hold the Tradition of Men, as the Washing of Pots and Cups: and many other such like things ye do.*

Fourth Argument.

To cross the Imitable Example of Christ in our Practice is Sin: But to submit to the Imposition of things Indifferent, though by Men in a Lawful Authority, is to cross the Imitable Example of Christ. Therefore so to do would be our Sin.

The *Major* is plain from all those Precepts that make it our Duty to follow *Treading in His Steps.* 1 Pet. 2. 21. *To Walk as He Walked.* 1 John, 2. 6. *To be followers of God as dear Children.* Ephe. 5. 1.

The *Minor* is as Evident from *Mat.* 15. 2, 3, 11, 13. Washing of Hands there spoken of, was an *Indifferent* Ceremony. The *Authority* Commanding it was *Lawful*, the Elders, or *Sanhedrim*, who at this time were not only their Ecclesiastical but Civil Rulers: Besides, the Argument from *Decency* to Induce it; yet all these Motives, in a thing so Innocent and Small as that was, could not prevail with our Saviour to quit His Liberty of Eating with *unwashed hands*;

hands; calls them Superſtitious and Blind Guides who were offended at him; And Juſtifies His Diſciples non Compliance by 3 Arguments: Firſt that it was and Un-Scriptural Tradition, ver. 9. *In vain do they Worſhip me, Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* Secondly; That the neglect of it Inferred no Moral Evil; *That theſe things did not defile a Man.* i. e. as to his Mind and Conſcience. v. 11. Thirdly; That it being not of God's Appointing, muſt be plucked up. ver. 13. *Every Plant which my Heavenly Father hath not Planted, ſhall be rooted up.* Whereby our Saviour intimates, that as the Phariſees had no *Divine Warrant* to preſcribe ſuch a Toy as that was, ſo God would at laſt declare His Indignation againſt their *Supererogatory Worſhip*, by pulling it up *Root and Branch.* From whence we gather this Rule; That when once *Humane Inventions* become *Impoſitions*, and lay a *Neceſſity* upon that, which God hath left free; then may we Lawfully reject them, as *Plants* of *Man's Setting*, and not of *GOD's owning.*

To Conclude; The Apoſtles praiſed the *Corinthians* for that *they had kept the Ordinances as he delivered them.* 1 Cor. 11. 1. 2. For ſurely GOD is more *Jealous of His Honour*, and *tender of His Worſhip*, than to leave it to our *Pleaſure*, to *Invent* or to *Add* what we ſhall *Judge Decent* thereunto, beyond what *Himſelf* hath preſcribed. And though 'tis true he hath not in ſo many Words *Expreſly forbidden* the things in Controverſie between us; yet he hath in all Ages teſtified His Diſlike; yea, Abhorrency of *Will Worſhip*; and that for this very Reaſon, becauſe *He had not Commanded it, nor ever came it into His Mind.* So Jer. 7. 31. Chap. 19. 5. and 32, 35. Deut. 12. 32. And ſo likewiſe in that fore-mentioned Scripture, *Ezek.* 43. 8. Where God diſcovers His ſevere Diſpleaſure againſt His People of Old, not for *neglecting* any part of His Worſhip which *He had Commanded them:* But for their *Preſumption* in *adding* ſomething to *His Worſhip* which *He had not Commanded.* In *ſetting their Threſhold by GOD's Threſhold, and their Poſt by GOD's Poſts.* It appears not that they *juſtled* out any thing that *GOD required*, but only thought fit to *Joyn* ſomething of their *Own* therewith: But for this very Reaſon muſt they be *Conſumed in GOD's Anger*, as the following Words declare.

Certain it is, that this very Principle is that which hath brought in all the *Popiſh Ceremonies* into the *Romiſh Church:* It cannot be denied that thoſe things which Chriſt or His Apoſtles have expreſly *Commanded*, we are to Receive and Practice, *as they have Commanded them:* But if any others ſhall take upon them to appoint unto Mens Conſciences any Rite or Ceremony, on *their own Conceiv-*

ed

ed Reason, because they are such things as *themselves* do reckon *decent* or *comely* in the *Worship of God*; It is an high Presumption in such against *Christ*; and against the Apostles Command, to yield Obedience thereunto. *Col.* 2. 20. Though it hath a *shew of Wisdom.* ver. 23. And not only doth the Apostles Example. *Gal.* 2. 3, 4, 5. bind us to [redacted] it; but in the Name of Our Lord Jesus Christ are we Commanded to with-draw our selves from such disorderly Walkers. 2 *Thess.* 3. 6. *Now we Command you Brethren, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye with-draw your selves from every Brother that walketh Disorderly, and not after the Tradition which he received of us.*

THE

THE SECOND PART.

Containing a Diſtinct and more Particular Conſideration of the Arguments drawn from Rom. 11. 16, 17. *Together with all other the moſt Material Arguments which are uſually urged for the Support of* Infants Baptiſm.

WE ſhall begin with thoſe Arguments which are drawn from *Rom.* 11. 16, 17. Where the Apoſtle tells us; That *if the Firſt Fruit be Holy, the Lump is alſo Holy. And if the Root be Holy ſo are the Branches. And if ſome of the Branches be broken off, and thou being a Wild Olive Tree wert graffed in among them, and with them partakeſt of the Root and Fatneſs of the Olive Tree, boaſt not againſt the Branches,* &c. From whence 'tis urged; That We Gentiles have now the ſame Graffing into the true Olive which the Jews formerly had; and that *our graffing* is Anſwerable to *their preſent Caſting out.* Now when they were taken in, they and their *Children* were taken in. When they were broken off, they and their *Children* were broken off. And therefore if our graffing in be anſwerable to theirs, We and *our Children* are graffed in together.

To this we Reply; That the *Inciſion*, or *Ingraffing* here Spoken of, may be either into the *Viſible*, or *Inviſible* Church. The graffing

in may be either by *Faith*, or by *Profession* of Faith, or by Some outward Ordinance. Children may be either *grown Men*, or *Infants*. The grafting in may be either *certain* or *probable*. *Certain*, either by reason of *Election*, the *Covenant of Grace* made unto them, or their *Natural birth*, being Children of Believers. *Probable*, as being *likely*, either because *frequently*, or for the most part it *happens* so; though not *necessary* and so *not certain*. The thing that is to be proved is; *That all the Infants of every Believer, are in the Covenant of Free Grace in Christ, and by Virtue thereof to be Baptized into the Communion of the Visible Church*. Now it may be granted that Infants of Believers are *frequently* or for the *most part* under the Election and Covenant of Grace, and so in the *Invisible* Church (which whether it be so or no, no meer Man can tell) And yet it not follow that *every Infant of a Believer*, in as much as he is the Child of a Believer, is under the Covenant of Grace, and therefore by Baptism is to be admitted into the *visible Church*. Now let it be never so *probable* that God continues His Election in the *Posterity of Believers*, and accordingly hath promised to be their God in the Covenant of Grace; yet if this be the Rule of Baptizing, then *the Infants of Believers only* and no other are to be Baptized: For the *Practice* must agree with the *Rule*. And so not *all* Infants of Believers neither, are to be Baptized, but the *Elect* in the Covenant of Grace only. If it be said, But we are to Judge *all* to be Elected, and in the Covenant of Grace, 'till the contrary appears. We Answer, That we are not to Judge *all to be Elected*, or in the Covenant of Grace, because we have the Declaration of GOD's Mind to the contrary. *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. And all Experience proves the contrary to be true. Nor is the Administration of an Outward Ordinance, Instituted by God according to such a Rule as is *not possible to be known*; but according to that which is *manifest* to the Ministers of it. And therefore since God conceals His Purpose of *Election*, and the *Covenant of Grace* which is Congruous to it, in respect of the *Persons Elected*, It is certain God would not have *this* the Rule according to which outward Ordinances are to be Administred.

But it is Urged, That our Grafting into the Olive Tree, the Church, is Answerable to that of the Jews. Now their Infants were Grafted in by *Circumcision*, and therefore ours are to be Grafted in by *Baptism*.

Reply. Can we indeed think that the Apostle here means by Grafting in, *Baptism*, or *Circumcision*; or an Incision by an *outward* Ordinance? If that were the meaning, then breaking off must be meant of *Uncircumcising*, or *Unbaptizing*. The whole Context speaks of the

the *Election* of ſome, and the *Rejection* of others: Of the *Breaking off by Unbelief*, and the *Standing by Faith*: And therefore the Grafting muſt be meant of the Inviſible Church, by *Election* and *Faith*; which Inviſible Church was firſt among the Jews, and therefore called *the Olive*, out of *Abraham* the Root, who is therefore ſaid to *bear them*. And becauſe *Abraham* had a double Capacity; one of a *Natural Father*, and the other of *the Father of the Faithful*: In reſpect of his *former* Capacity, ſome are called *Branches according to Nature*. In reſpect of his *latter* Capacity, others are called *Wild Olives by Nature*, yet Graffed in *by Faith*. And therefore when it is ſaid that ſome of *the Natural Branches were broken off*, the meaning is not, that ſome of the Branches in the *Inviſible Church* may be broken off: But it is plainly to be underſtood in reference to the *Natural Branches* only; that is, of ſuch alone who had nothing but their *Natural Pedigree*, or deſcent from *Abraham* as a *Natural Father* to inſiſt upon. And in this reſpect it is expreſly told us, that *ſome* of the Natural Branches only were broken off: For *ſome of them* were Branches in *both reſpects*, and accordingly were *not broken off*; but we Believing Gentiles are ſaid to be *Graffed in amongſt them*, and *with them are partakers of the Root and Fatneſs of the Olive Tree*.

If you ſay then, that *the Gentiles have now the ſame Graffing into the true Olive, which the Jews formerly had*; We muſt Remember that known and allowed Diſtinction, Concerning the *Subſtance* of the Covenant, and the *Adminiſtration* of it. Now it is true that in reſpect of the *Subſtance* of the Covenant, we have the ſame Graffing in to the Olive, the Church of the Faithful, of which *Abraham* is the Root, that the Believing Jews had: And ſo we by Faith are ſaid to be made *Partakers of the Root and Fatneſs of the Olive Tree*: Or in plainer Terms, as the Apoſtle Phraſeth it. *Eph.* 3. 6. *We are now made Fellow Heirs, and of the ſame Body, and partakers of his Promiſe in Chriſt, through the Goſpel.* In reſpect of which all *Believing* Gentiles are *Abraham's Seed, the Iſrael of God, One in Chriſt*. But if you mean it of the *Outward* Adminiſtration of this Ingraffing, by *Circumciſion* or *Baptiſm*; nothing is more untrue: For indeed the *Outward Adminiſtration* which then was, is utterly taken away, removed, and changed; it being that which whilſt it ſtood was the Ground of a Separation between the Jews and the Gentiles. And it is therefore taken away on this very purpoſe, that the *Enmity* betwixt *Jews* and *Gentiles* might be removed, and they made *One in Chriſt* by his Death.

And if you ſay that *our preſent Graffing In muſt be anſwerable to their preſent Caſting Out*. It is true, our preſent Graffing In, is anſwerable to their (or rather for their) Caſting out. That is, GOD would ſupply in His Olive Tree the Church, *the caſting away of the Jews*, by

by the *Calling of the Gentiles*, who are now by Faith Grafted in among the *Remaining Believing Jews*, who continued as yet unbroken off: But it doth not therefore follow that the *Infants of Believing Gentiles* are Grafted In together with *themselves*, as the *Jewish Infants* were; because uncapable of making that Profession of Faith which the Gospel now requires.

But it is further Urged, that if the *Fruit be Holy, the Lump is also Holy. And if the Root be Holy, so are the Branches* As for that of the *Root*, it is variously Conceived by Interpreters, some understanding thereby the *Covenant* to be meant; some *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*; and some *Abraham only*; which last, in its proper Sense, I Conceive to be most Genuine. Whereas therefore the Apostle tells us, that *the first Fruit is Holy*; the *Lump Holy*, *The Root Holy*, and *the Branches Holy*: From whence some would Infer a *derivative* Holiness from the Parents to the Children; that is, the Father being Holy, and accepted in Covenant with G O D, the Children are so too, *being Beloved for the Fathers Sake*. The Truth is, the Holiness the Apostle speaks of, is First in respect of G O D's Election, *Holiness Personal*; and *Inherent* in G O D's Intention. *He hath chosen us, that we should be Holy*. Eph. 1. 4. Secondly, It is also Holiness *derivative* or descending, but not from any Ancestors but from *Abraham* only; and that not as a *Natural*, but as a *Spiritual Father*, or *the Father of the Faithful*, wherein he was a Lively Image or Figure of Christ Himself; and is derived from the Covenant of Grace which passed in his Name to him and to his Seed. And Lastly, It shall be *Inherent*, being *actually* Communicated by the Spirit of G O D, when they shall be *actually* Called. And this is such a kind of Holiness, as is more than a bare *Adherent* or *Relative Holiness*; being also *inherent* by Faith, whereby they are Holy as the Root is Holy.

Now whereas you understand it to be the Case of *any Believers* to be a *Holy Root* to their *Posterity*: This is not true; For in the Apostles Resemblance, *Abraham only is a Holy Root*, in whose Name the Covenant runs: No other Man, though a Believer, being the Father *of the Faithful* but *Abraham only*; And the whole Body of Believers is compared to *the Olive*, and each Believer to a *Branch* that partakes of the *Root and Fatness of the Olive Tree*; not in *outward* Dispensations only, but in *Saving Graces* also; which indeed is mainly here intended: For it cannot rationally be Supposed that by *the Fatness of the Olive Tree* we are to understand any *External Priviledge* whatsoever in its self, belonging to us or ours: For that of it self would be but a *dry*, a *barren*, and a *sapless* Advantage: But by the Fatness of the Olive Tree, we are certainly to understand that *Spiritual Benefit* and Advantage that *from Christ* is to be Communicated or Derived unto us, who was indeed herein Represented by *Abraham*, who is to this

this purpose therefore called *the Friend of God*, and the *Father of the Faithful*: And whose Prerogative herein no other Man, though a Believer, whether before or since, could ever justly pretend unto.

But whereas it is yet further Urged; That the Church of the Jews, and that of the Gentiles is *still the same*; that is, It is still the same Visible Church now, that it was then. And so much (say you) the Apostles Simile or Metaphor of Ingrafting will bear, or it signifies nothing. And if the *visible Church* be the same, Why should not the *Subjects* be the same, *viz. Children*, and the *Priviledge* be the same, *viz.* an *External Badge* and *Cognisance* given to the *Children* of the Church *now*, as well as under the *Law*?

We Answer; That true it is, the Church of the Jews and that of the Gentiles is one and the same, in reference to the true *Essence*, or Inward *Substance* of either: In which respect, as we have said before, the Believing Gentiles (according to the Apostles Metaphor) are here said to be *Grafted in amongst them*, and with them to be made *Partakers of the Root and Fatness* of the Olive Tree. And in reference hereunto, it is rightly added by the Apostle; that *the Gifts and Callings of God are without Repentance*; The *Inward Substance* of the Church, and of the Covenant of Grace whereon 'tis Founded, being *Invariable* and that which shall remain for ever *Immoveable*. But it doth not therefore follow that there should be no Alteration, in respect of the *Outward Form, or Administration of either*: For in this Respect, as hath been already proved, there is a wide Difference between them: For barely to be of the Natural Seed of *Abraham* was sufficient to be admitted a Member of the *Jewish Church*; but not so under the *Gospel*, unless we be of the Seed of *Abraham* according to the *Spirit*. And till this be Evidenced, neither therefore doth the *External Badge* or *Cognisance* belong unto us.

And thus it may appear, that this Illustrious Scripture is very much darkened, by applying that Holiness and Incision here spoken of, to *Outward Dispensations* only in the *visible Church*; which is meant of *Saving Graces* in the *Invisible* by Faith. And whilst you make *every Believer a like Root to his Posterity, as* Abraham *the Father of the Faithful was to his*; Since no Believer in the World, whether before or since, had ever the like Priviledge or Prerogative conferred upon him, to be Called the *Father of the Faithful*, as *Abraham* was.

But for the further support of Infants Baptism, It is Objected.

First, That since Infants stood visible Members of the Church for 2000 Years under the *Legal Administration*; It is unlikely they should be *now* Excluded.

To this we Anſwer; Firſt, That they ſtood Excluded altogether as much, above 2000 Years before Circumciſion, as they do now: So that an Ordinance for their Church-member-ſhip was not ſo *from the Beginning*; but came in by *ſpecial Inſtitution long ſince.*

Secondly, The *other Adminiſtration* in which they ſtood, was Eſtabliſhed with a Seed to be Propagated by *Natural Generation* according to expreſs Command. *Gen.* 17. 9, 10. *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations.* Verſe 10. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep ——Every Man-Child among you ſhall be Circumciſed.* But where have we Command for the like in *this Adminiſtration?* For though it ſhould be granted that the Believing Gentiles are intended as the proper *Subjects* of the general *Obligation* mentioned Verſe 9. which yet cannot be for the Reaſons given in the latter part of this Diſcourſe upon that Subject. Yet the Baptiſm of *Infants* cannot thence be juſtly Inferred: For there *God* only ſaith; *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations.* It is true by the Seed there ſpoken of, you underſtand the *Spiritual Seed* in the Goſpel Day; and by keeping the Covenant, their keeping it in the proper *Sign* of it belonging to the *Goſpel*, that is, *Baptiſm*: But where lies the Ground for *Infants Baptiſm* in all this? Is there a Syllable there concerning *Infants* that they alſo muſt be *Signed*? To keep the *Sign* of GOD's Covenant (ſay you) is to wear it *themſelves*, and to put it upon all theirs: The Believing Gentiles are to keep the *Sign* of GOD's Covenant: Therefore the Believing Gentiles are to wear it *themſelves*, and to put it upon all theirs. But who told you ſo? Or what Scripture is there that proves that *thus* ſtands the Caſe with the *Believing Gentiles*? That is, that they are not only to wear the *Sign* of the Covenant *themſelves*, but to put it upon *all theirs*? All that you can prove, is, that *thus* it was with *Abraham* and His, under the *former* Adminiſtration; and when you can alſo prove that *thus* it muſt be *now*; you ſay *ſomething*, otherwiſe all you ſay is Impertinent. The Covenant of *Promiſe*, 'tis true (*Gen.* 12. 2, 3. *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18.) is one and the ſame to *them* and to *us*; but the Covenant of Circumciſion, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. was plainly *Typical* and *Temporary*; and in a *Figure* it Miniſtred unto the ends of the *Everlaſting Covenant*. And therefore it ſufficed as unto *that* Adminiſtration, if the People, the Children thereof were of the *Natural* Seed of *Abraham*; becauſe by that *ſhadowy Covenant*, Young and Old, Good and Bad, were all alike Covenanters; and all alike in a Capacity to be the Subjects of an Adminiſtration, which was to ſerve unto the *Example and Shadow of Heavenly things, till the Seed ſhould come to whome the Promiſe was made.* Gal. 3. 19. But the Goſpel Adminiſtration, that brings Chriſt, and all the Myſtery of His Grace,

in

in the Truth and Reality, and not in the Figure and Example; is not Receptive of *Children*, as to the Principle upon which it ſtands, any other way than upon ſome *viſible Demonſtration of Faith*, whereby CHRIST comes to be received, who are therefore called *the Sons of God*. John 1. 12, 13. *As many as Received Him, to them gave He Power*; that is, the Right or Priviledge *to become the Sons of GOD; Even to them that Believe in His Name: Born not of Blood, nor of the Will of the Fleſh, nor of the Will of Man, but of GOD.* Thus the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 4. 28. Calls the Saints of the Churches of *Galatia*, *Children of the Promiſe*, in Oppoſition to the *Seed according to the Fleſh*. Verſe 7. *Neither becauſe they are the Seed of* Abraham *are they all Children, but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy Seed be called, that is, they which are the Children of the Fleſh, theſe are not the Children of GOD; but the Children of the Promiſe are counted for the Seed.* Whereunto many other Scriptures might be added; yea, the whole Stream of the New Teſtament witneſſeth to a Seed *according to Calling*, and (as to the Rule of their *Admiſſion*) all *Living Stones* for the Conſtitution of the Church of GOD; and not one Word in Favour of a Seed *according to the Fleſh*, as to *Admiſſion* into the Church upon that Principle of Birth Priviledge.

We are told indeed, that the Believing Gentiles are now *Graffed in*, not upon the *Legal Branch*, but upon the *Root Olive*, which affordeth all the *Nouriſhment* that either the Jews had, or the Gentiles have. Which *Root Olive* is the Covenant of Promiſe, that was 430 Years before the Law. Now into that State of things (ſay you) wherein not the *Law*, but the *Goſpel* Preached unto *Abraham*, did *Obtain*: God was a GOD, not only to the Father, but to the Children; yea to all his Family. And the Father of the Family did not only give Himſelf, but all his Children, and even his Servants, all His to GOD, to take his *Sign* upon them, and ſo it muſt be *now*.

To which We Reply; that it is indeed the unſpeakable Bleſſedneſs of the Believing Gentiles, to be Graffed in upon ſuch a Stock; not upon the *Legal Branch*, but upon the *Root Olive*, which affordeth all the *Nouriſhment*, that either the Jews had or the Gentiles have; that Root Olive being no other than Chriſt Himſelf; who was given for a Covenant of the People, and *a Light to Lighten the* Gentiles. The Goſpel of whoſe Grace was indeed Preached to *Abraham* 430 Years at leaſt, before the Law was given. But what then? Doth it therefore follow that the Believing Gentiles are put into that very State of things as under Circumciſion? Where is that Scripture that affirms it? Evident it is that though Circumciſion was in uſe before, as well as under the Law; and though Jeſus Chriſt Himſelf is by the Apoſtle Stiled, the Miniſter of the Circumciſion, for the Truth of God, to confirm the Promiſes made unto the Fathers; yet as it can-

not

not be denied, but that it was *adopted* into the Legal Family: And that it was also *adopted* unto the Nature and Quality of the Legal Dispensation: So it is as evident that it is *now Abolished*. And we can meet with no one Text in all the New Testament that tells us that *Baptism* is appointed to have the *same Place* and *Use* in the Church of God that *Circumcision* had; but rather much to the contrary, as hath been already proved. And it being manifest that the *External* Administration of the Covenant is *changed*, to what it was in *Abraham's* Time, it plainly follows that there is an *Alteration* of the *Rule* that must direct us in our Practice in that Respect.

Obj. 2. If this Interpretation hold good, there would be a very great *Change* in the *Extent* of the Covenant; *narrower* under the *Gospel*, than it was under the *Law*; and yet *no notice* in all the Book of God given of such a *Change*.

We Reply. *First*, That the Covenant of Grace, hath one and the same *Extent*, before, under, and since the Law, in Respect of the *Substance* of it, or considered singly in its self, as hath been already declared. In Respect of the *Administration* of it; indeed it is *Changeable*, and hath been often *Changed*.

Secondly, we say, that the *Administration* under the *Gospel*, is not *narrower*, than that under the *Law*, because it admits not *Infants Baptism*. The Administration under the Law was Circumscribed to a little Land, and a small People; the Bounds of the other are stretched *from Sea to Sea, and from the River to the ends of the Earth*. That was restrained to the Seed and Family of *Abraham*; the other extends to the Seed and Family of *Christ*. That had its Existence but 2000 Years, upon an *Occasional*, *Temporary Principle*; the other is suited to Answer *a Principle existing from Everlasting to Everlasting*. That Administration was the *Shadow*, *Figure*, and *Example*; the other, the *Substance*. That was the *Handmaid*, the other the *Mistress*. And if the Case be thus between these two Administrations, can we Reasonably Charge the *Gospel* Administration with more *narrowness* than the *Law*, because of *the Discontinuance of the Birth-Priviledge?*

Thirdly, Although the Grace of the Gospel be extended far beyond the Grace under the Law; yet as to *Persons*, the Children of the Gospel, are formed to so *strict*, and *refined* a Qualification; that in *that Respect*, we grant that the *Law* had a Latitude beyond the *Gospel:* But yet with this Mark; that that *Indulgence* of the Law was one of the great *Imperfections*, which the Gospel came to *Reform*. *Mat.* 3. 10, 11, 12. And of this *Change*, the Book of God doth give abundant Notice. *Gen.* 21. 10. *Cast out the Bond-woman, and her Son*, &c. Shortly after the Institution of the Ordinance of Circumcision, for the Priviledge of *the Seed according to the Flesh*. The Lord brings forth a Propherical Instance in the very Family of *Abraham*, wherein this great *Change of*

Church

Church Priviledge, was revealed, *viz.* That it was to be taken from *the Carnal Seed*, and that it should be given *to the Seed according to Grace*, under the Gospel Administration. And to put that matter out of Question, we have the unvailing of this Prophetical Instance to the very same purpose, in *Gal.* 4. 30. So also, *Isa.* 54. 1. *Sing O Barren, thou that beareſt not.* What she was the Apostle tells us. *Gal.* 4. 26, 27. *ver.* 5. *Thy Maker is thy Husband, the Lord of Hosts is his Name, and thy Redeemer the Holy One of* Israel. At *ver.* 13. We have the Refined Qualification of her Children and People. *And all thy Children shall be Taught of the Lord:* Where we have a Prophetical Description of the *Gospel Church State*, which the People of a *Fleshly Extraction* only, from the most sanctified Saints, cannot possible compare unto. It must therefore necessarily be understood of another Seed, even of a Seed *begotten of God, by the Word of Truth.* Jam. 1. 18. the Gospel People. And this was a fair Notice given of the *Change* in Question; to wit, *narrower* as to the *Qualifications of the Persons*, but more *extended in Grace.* Another fair warning for the Fleshly Seed, is, *Isa.* 65. 15. *For the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his People by another Name.* In all which, we find plain notice given of the *Change of the Old Administration*, which gloried in the Seed of *Abraham, after the Flesh*; and as plainly foretelling the Cessation of that *Propagation*, to give place to the *New Administration*, and the true Seed of *Abraham*, the Seed *according to the Spirit.* And indeed, the Change of the Administration, necessarily removes the fleshly Seed, because it hath a standing by no other Right, than what it had under that Covenant.

As for the *New Testament*, it every where abounds with Evidence to the Proof hereof, as appears from the several Scriptures that have in part been already opened and discussed, in the former part of this Discourse: Wherein it hath been proved, that though *Infants* were comprehended with their Parents in the *Jewish* Church; yet none but such as are capable of making an *Actual Profession of Faith and Repentance*, with some competent Measure of Fruitfulness, answerable thereunto, are to be admitted to the Priviledge of *Church-Membership*, under the Gospel. To this purpose we are told. *Mat.* 3. 7. That when many of the Pharisees and Sadduces came to be Baptized of *John*: Though their being of the *Natural Seed of Abraham*, was a sufficient ground why they should be *Circumcised*; yet it was no sufficient ground why they should be *Baptized:* And therefore their *Birth-Priviledge notwithstanding*, *John* rejects them as *a Generation of Vipers*, and bids them *bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance.* 'Tis true, those that *John* had now to deal with were *Men at Age*, and such also as were exceedingly *Debauched*, and *Vitious* in their Conversations: But then it must be withal considered, that we Read of none *at Age* that were rejected upon any such Account from *Circumcision*, which is a clear Argument of

of the *Change* of the Administration, and that *the terms of Admission into the Gospel-Church, were far stricter now than they were before.* And to take off their former Plea, he deals therefore plainly with them upon that Account, And tells them, *ver.* 9. *Think not to say within your selves, we have* Abraham *to our Father; for God is able of Stones to raise up Children unto* Abraham. *And now also, the Ax is laid unto the Root of the Trees; therefore, every Tree which bringeth not forth good Fruit is hewn down*; which hath been already explained to be clearly Exclusive of a meer *Carnal Seed*, or a Seed barely *after the Flesh*, in respect of *Gospel Church Ordinances:* For upon that Account, the Ax is here said to be laid unto the *Root of the Trees*.

And as plainly doth the Spirit of God by the Apostle, give us an Account of the Exclusion of the Fleshly Seed, in that respect; when he tells us as he doth, 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Wherefore, henceforth know we no Man after the Flesh*, &c. *For if any Man be in Christ, he is a New Creature, Old things are past away, all things are become New*; which hath been already distinctly explained to the same purpose: Together, with *Rom.* 11. 17. 24. Where he tells us, that *the Natural Branches are broken off.* And that the Gentiles have their *Standing* in the Church, only *by Faith.* And no where doth the New Testament Countenance that conceit, that our *Posterity* have any Right of standing as Members of the Christian Church, *by Vertue of our Faith*: But we our selves must *stand by our Faith*, and they (if they have any) *by their own*: Otherwise, they are of course excluded; *The Natural Branches* being now *broken off*, and no others in their Room, barely as such, according to Gospel Rule, to be admitted to Gospel Ordinances.

But against this it is Objected; "That as the same Church continued under the Gospel, which did exist, or was in being before: So "the very same Church Members kept their places and standing in "it, which were of it before; except such as were *broken off by Unbelief*; which must not (say you) be understood in Reference to the "*Little Children* of the *Believing* Jews, unless it can be made out that "*their Little Children* were guilty also of the *same Sin of Unbelief*, upon the Account of which, *others* were thus broken off.

To this we Reply. *First*, that as it is Evident that the *Children* of the *Unbelieving* Jews, are to this day, together with their *Parents*, broken off and unchurched (which can be upon no other Account, than because of the *Personal Unbelief*, both of the *Parents* and *Children:* For they have both of them *Believing Abraham* to their *Father*, as much *now* as *before*) So it is as Evident, that the *same Sin of Unbelief*, was as justly Chargeable upon the *Children* of those of them that *did believe*, until wrought upon as their *Parents were* by the *Preaching of the Word.* And by Reason hereof it was that *all sorts of Little Children*, as well as those *at Age*, that were destitute of *actual Faith*, were now

to

to be broken off from the *Gospel Church*. For though 'tis true, the Children of the *Believing* Jews, and the Children of the *Unbelieving* Jews also, were upon the *bare* Account of their *Relation to* Abraham, only, by the *Express Command of God*, under the *former* Administration, admitted to a State of Church Membership, *their Unbelief notwithstanding*: (For whether they were *Believers* or no, was not as all any Matter of Enquiry, in Respect either of the *Parents*, or the *Children*, as to a State of Church-Membership *then*) yet as hath been already proved, the Case is *now altered*: A New Law, and a New Church-State, (in Respect of the *External* Administration thereof,) was now to take place in the World: So that the *terms* of their *former standing* in the Church would not *suffice* for their *standing now*: For nothing short of *Actual Faith and Repentance*, or an *External Profession thereof*, could be now sufficient; which *Qualifications* not being to be found in *Young Infants*, whether those of *Believers*, or those of *Unbelievers*; they were therefore *both broken off*, as well the *one*, as the *other* of them.

Secondly, In this Respect therefore it ought to be duly considered, that the Holy Scripture doth conclude us all, *by Nature*, to be in a state of *Unbelief*, and *Children of wrath*, *as well as others*; and such we *continue* from our *Infancy*, 'till *converted*, and wrought upon by the *Grace of the Gospel*. A vain thing it is therefore to pretend unto a Faith wrought in us from our *Natural Birth*, as the Seed of *Believers*: For *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God*. Rom. 10. 17. As the ordinary means by which it is wrought in us. And this way of Conveyance, *little Infants*, as well those of *Believers*, as those of *Unbelievers* being uncapable of; they are therefore *all of them*, till then, to be reckoned as the Scripture concludes them, in a state of *Unbelief*. Rom. 11. 32. And this being the true state of the Case; No wonder if the *Children of Believers*, as well as *others*, were broken off from the *Olive Tree*, the Church, the *terms* of standing therein being now *altered*, as hath been declared.

Mr. *Allen* indeed also tells us; that since the Jewish *Infants* were under the *former* Administration, at the *Call*, *Election*, and *Appointment* of God, admitted with their Parents, as *Visible Members* of the Jewish Church: And since the *Gifts and Callings of God are without Repentance*, Rom. 11. 29. We have Reason therefore to conclude, that the *Infants* of *Christian Parents* have the same Right to a *Visible* Church-Membership *now*, as *theirs had then*.

But then Mr. *Allen* should have considered, that though *the Gifts and Callings of God are* indeed *without Repentance*, in respect of the *Inward Substance* of the Covenant of Grace: Or of an *Invisible* Membership, in the *Invisible* Church; yet it doth not therefore follow, that they are without Repentance, in Respect of an *External* Membership in the *Visible* Church; but are and were Repealable, as by said Experi-

ence it is found to be too true, by the main Body of the Jewish Nation, *Children and all*, who by Reason of their *Unbelief*, are actually and undeniably, both *Parents* and *Children* also, un-Church'd, broken off, and rejected to this very day. True it is as the Apostle also tells us; *if they abide not still in Unbelief, they shall be grafted in again.* And he there also tells us, God is both able and willing so to do: But then we must also remember, that as they and their Children were *both* broken off because of *Unbelief*; upon which very Account, they do both *still* continue broken off to this very day: So therefore as a Just and a Necessary Consequence of the former; it will also naturally follow, that it is only by the *Actual* Faith of both *Parents* and *Children*, as an Instrumental means, by which *either of them*, shall be blessed with that their desired Restauration.

And this may serve also for a Confutation of that Groundless and Unscriptural conceit of Mr. *Allen*; when he affirms that the *Infants of Believers are* Abraham's *Spiritual Seed*, and that upon this Account it was that they were admitted to the Priviledge of Church-Membership under the *Law*. For thus he tells us; "If such Infants are as much of "the Church; and as much *Abraham's Spiritual Seed*, as ever Infants in "the Old Testament-Church were; then they can be no more uncapable than they were of a solemn Admission into the Church, by the "Ordinance of Initiation for the time being, as Baptism is now, and "as Circumcision was then. But this which Mr. *Allen* takes here for granted, and is indeed the *Foundation* of his Argument, we utterly deny, as not having been at all proved, nor indeed can be proved by him, or any other; to wit, *That the Infants of Believers have any where in Scripture, the Denomination of* Abraham's *Spiritual Seed.* This is a most certain Truth, that as *Abraham* himself had a double Capacity, one of a *Natural Father*, the other, *the Father of the Faithful*: So he had a two-fold *Seed*. For *First*, he had a *Seed* that proceeded from him, according to the Course of *Natural* Generation only. And *Secondly*, some were his *Natural* and *Spiritual Seed* also; such as was *Isaac*, and all the *Faithful*, who proceeded from *Abrahams* Loyns. To which, we must add a *Third* sort, and that is, all true *Believers*, or the Elect of God in *all Nations*, who by Vertue of their *Interest in Christ*, have also in Scripture, the Denomination of *Abraham's Seed*, who yet can lay no claim to *Abraham* as their Father, according to *the common Course of Nature.* And to imagine that *Abraham* hath any Seed in any other Religious or Spiritual Consideration whatsoever under the Gospel, is to be wise above what is written: For (whatever the Jewish Children were,) to say that the Children of Christians are Relatively Holy, that they are Church-Members, and as much Christians externally, as the Children of the Jews were Jews externally, as some have suggested: All these are but unproved Figments, and Unscriptural Dictates. And

there-

therefore from hence to infer their Relation to *Abraham* as his Spiritual Seed; and thence that they are the proper Subjects of Baptism, is no other than to build a lofty Structure upon a Sandy Foundation. If then we shall affirm that the *Infants* of Believers *now* are *Abraham's Seed*, they must of Necessity come under one or another of these Heads. To say that they are so, in either of the two *former* Respects, cannot be at all pretended unto, if in the *latter*; neither can this with any shadow of Truth be affirmed: For thus it was not with all the *Natural* Seed of *Abraham himself*, as the Apostle expresly affirms. *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Neither* (saith he) *because they are the Seed of* Abraham, *are they all Children*; *but in* Isaac *shall thy Seed be called, that is, they that are the Children of the Flesh; these are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed.* So likewise, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye* Abraham's Seed, *and Heirs according to the Promise.* Therefore to affirm that *all the Infants of Believers are the Spiritual Seed of* Abraham, as there is no Scripture that *proves* it, so it is directly *contrary* to the Scripture; and indeed, *contrary* to our own most *common* and *obvious* Experience; whilst we consider with all, that as for many of *Abraham's own* Natural Posterity, they are so far from being his *Spiritual* Seed, that as hath been already observed, together with their *Children*; they are Unchurched, broken off, and rejected by God, because of their *Unbelief*, to this very day: Which yet had not been, had they been the *Spiritual*, as well as the *Natural Seed of Abraham*: For sure it is altogether Inconsistent with the terms of the Covenant of Grace, *the Gifts and Callings whereof are without Repentance*, that *Abraham's Spiritual Seed*, or that such as are Members of the *Invisible*, as well as the *Visible* Church, should be at all cast off, rejected and forsaken as the *Jews* now are.

Upon the whole therefore of our Answer to the forementioned *Objection*; That *if this Interpretation hold good, there would be a great change in the extent of the Covenant, narrower under the Gospel than it was under the Law; and yet no notice in all the Book of God given of such a Change*: We say that there is *abundant notice* given unto us, in the Book of God, and that both in the *Old* and *New Testament* also, concerning the *change* in question, *viz.* the disfranchisement of Infants, from their so long enjoyed Priviledge of Church-Membership. We grant that under the *Law* they were *admited* thereunto with their Parents: But the Scriptures already alledged, do abundantly prove their *Exclusion* under the *Gospel* Administration. Unto which we shall only at present add, *Heb.* 7. 12. *For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of Necessity, a change also of the Law*; which *Change* of the *Law* there spoken of, must needs include *Circumcision*, with all the Priviledges and Appurtenances belonging to it. And therefore, as *Infants Church-Membership*, came in with the *Law of Circumcision*; so it went out, and was Repealed with it.

Objection 3. If this Interpretation be true, the *Believing* Jews should have *loss* upon their Repentance and Belief of the Gospel, if their Children *formerly* Church Members, should *now* be Excluded upon the *Faith* and Repentance of their Parents.

To this we Answer; *First*, It is true that in some Sence a Jew converted to the Gospel should have *loss*; and particularly in that point of Signing his Fleshly Seed, by an Ordinance; together with the Fall of all the Glory of their *Sanctuary*, and *pompous Priest-hood*, so much, and so long, the joy and boasting of that Nation: Which the Spirit of GOD fore-saw and fore-told. *Isa.* 8. 14. And hence it came to pass that *Christ* became so great an *Offence*, and the Gospel so sore a *Stone of Stumbling, and Rock of Offence* to them all; yea, even to many of them, after they had submitted to the Gospel: yea, the Gentile Churches were scarce, if at all, preserved from Stumbling hereat, with the Jews. But all this Loss, well considered, would amount to no more, than what befals a Man, who from the Priviledges of a *Servant*, is Invested into the Priviledges of a *Son*. And this was the very Case. *Gal.* 4. 4. *God sent forth His Son*, &c. Verse 5. *To redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons*. Verse 7. *Wherefore thou art no more a Servant, but a Son*. And the Reason of this Change the Apostle plainly sheweth us, Verse 22. *He that was after the Bond-Woman was Born after the Flesh, but He of the Free-Woman was by Promise*. There was an Infinite difference in the Propagation of the Seed of the *former Church-state*, and of the Seed of the *Gospel-state*; no less than between *Nature* and the *power of God*, as was in the Types *Ishmael* and *Isaac*.

Secondly; Neither hath this Change brought any other *loss* upon the Child: But First, The Interest which it *had* in the Everlasting Covenant under the former Administration, it *still retains*. Secondly, The Benefits and Advantages which it had by the Parent, are so much bettered, by how much the Spiritual State of the Parent under the Gospel, by Baptism after Faith, is better ratified than under the Law. Thirdly, All other and further Benefits from the Covenant, are more freely and fully tendred, and with many enforcing Advantages brought near to be had and enjoyed. Fourthly, It is an Advantage, that as a Token of the Expiration of the Bondage Church State, their Signing upon the *Natural Birth* is also at an end; and their Signing into all these Priviledges transferred to an Ordinance upon the visible *Test of their New Birth*: Without which no Word of GOD can be found to raise them to the *visible* Dignity and Prerogative of the Sons and Heirs of *Sarah*, the Gospel Covenant, or Administration.

Thirdly,

Thirdly. There is no Colour or Warrant from the Word of GOD, that Jesus Christ in the Day of His Appearing, did Establish any one Ordinance in the Church, which did Impower Communion in his *Intercession*, to be practicable duly, by a Person in an *unregenerate* State; or at least, that makes not an External Profession thereof.

Object. 4. But what *hope* can we have of our Infants, if they must not be admitted unto Christian Baptism, nor reputed as Members of the Common Body and Church of the Faithful?

We Answer: First, If the Hope of the Parent for the Childs Salvation be grounded upon the Administration of an Ordinance in Infancy; then neither had the Patriarchs for above 2000 Years, Hope of their Children; which we find untrue by *Noahs* Prophecy, *Gen.* 9. 26, 27.

Secondly, We demand what Hopes are intended; and by what Scriptures the same are Annexed to the Administration of an Ordinance in Infancy?

Thirdly, We justifie a Holy Hope in Believers in behalf of their Children, which is grounded upon plain Scriptures without Infant Baptism.

Fourthly, This Argument seemeth to carry in it this Conclusion, That Christian People by Infants Baptism, are by Scripture Grounds assured according to Gospel Hope, of the Salvation of their Children. But there wants a Proof for it; and we suppose it is not received as a Truth by many that Oppose us in this Point.

Object. 5. If Children may not now be Baptized, this makes the Priviledge of Believers under the *Gospel* to be less than was theirs under the *Law*: For their Children were all admitted as Members of the Visible Church by the Ordinance of Circumcision; and we cannot but conclude, that our Priviledges for our Selves and for our Children, are at least as Honourable, Large, and Comfortable as theirs; and therefore our Infants are to be Baptized.

To this we Answer, That it is true our Priviledge is the same with theirs, in respect of the *Substance of the Covenant of Grace*: But neither was *that* made to the Jews *Natural* Posterity, as *such*, nor is it made to *ours*. As for *Circumcision*, It was indeed a *Priviledge* to the *Jews*, in comparison of the *Heathens*, but a *Burthen* in comparison of *us*; And it is accordingly so termed by the Apostle, *Acts* 15. 10. *Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear.* And to the same purpose the Apostle *Paul* also exhorts the Believers. *Gal.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4.

to *ſtand faſt in their Chriſtian Liberty, and not to be Intangled again in their* former *Yoke of Bondage* in this reſpect. And therefore it is ſo far from being a *Priviledge* to our Children that they ſhould have either *it*, or any other thing in the place and uſe of *it*, that the Truth is, it is a great *Priviledge* that they have neither *it*, nor any other thing in the *ſtead of it*, but Chriſt manifeſted in the Fleſh. And the Parents loſe nothing by denying Baptiſm to Infants, in the place and uſe of Circumciſion; but it is indeed, if rightly conſidered, a Benefit to them to want it, God not appointing it, nor making a Promiſe of Grace to be confirmed by it to the Infants of Believers.

Clear it is, that we have *no better Promiſes* in reſpect of the *Subſtance of the Covenant of Grace* now, than they had then; only the *Adminiſtration* of the Covenant is now *better* than it was to them. Then it was with Expectation of Chriſt *to come*; now, with Aſſurance of Chriſt *already come* in the Fleſh, and accompliſhing what was foretold of Him. Then Chriſt was ſhadowed with *dark Types*; now we ſee Him unvailed in a *plain Hiſtory*: So that though it be true that the Priviledges of Believers are now many ways Inlarged in ſome reſpects; yet ſimply the Covenant of Grace is not inlarged in reſpect of the Subſtance of it. The Promiſes of Grace are ſtill belonging to the Elect and Believers, and to no other.

In reſpect of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. it is plain the Jews had ſome Priviledges above us: but the want of ſome Priviledges which *they had*, is abundantly recompenced unto us, by other Priviledges which *they had not*: Particularly in reſpect of the clearneſs of the Revelation of the Goſpel Covenant; and alſo in reſpect of the univerſal tender and publication of it; in as much as now not only the ſmall Nation of the Jews, but alſo of all Nations, Believers are brought into the participation of the ſame; together with the more abundant Communication of the Holy Spirit. To which purpoſe we are told that *the Holy Spirit was not yet given*; to wit, neither in that manner, nor meaſure, as afterward, *becauſe Chriſt was not yet Glorified*. Jo. 7. 39. So that it is no Abſurdity to grant that the Jews might have more Privilebges in *ſome things* than we; and yet our Caſe and Condition to ſpeak ſimply better than theirs, by reaſon of *other Priviledges* we have above them, which abundantly recompence the defect of thoſe Priviledges of theirs, whether real or ſuppoſed. And the Truth is, Priviledges are ſo Arbitrary and Various, that God gives them as He thinks good, oft times, without aſſigning any ſpecial Reaſon. So that no Argument can be drawn, thus; GOD gave ſuch a Priviledge to the Jews; therefore we muſt have ſuch a Priviledge too, except we can prove it is GOD's Will it ſhould be ſo. And therefore this Argument is of no force without an *Inſtitution*, to attempt to prove, that becauſe the Jews had a Priviledge to *Circumciſe* their Infants,

saints, therefore we must have a Priviledge to *Baptize* ours. Nor indeed is there any Scripture that proves that *Baptism* of Infants is a Priviledge granted by GOD in lieu of *Circumcision*.

Object. 6. But Circumcision was a *Seal* of the New Covenant to Believers and their Seed under the Law; and therefore so is Baptism to the Seed of Christian Parents under the Gospel: the denial therefore of Baptism to Infants, is the denial of a great Priviledge which of right *belongs* unto them.

To this We Answer in the *Negative*; That neither was Circumcision a *Seal* to them; nor much less a *Seal* to them of the *New Covenant*; for then they had been *all Saved*. It is true it was a Seal, Confirmation, or Ratification of *the Faith* that *Abraham had* long before he was Circumcised: But so it could not be said of *Infants* that had *no Faith*. It was indeed a *Sign* put into the Flesh of the Infant; but a Sign and Seal *only* to *Abraham*, Witnessing to Him that he not only had a Justifying Faith, but to the Truth of the Promises, *viz.* That *he should be the Father of many Nations*, Rom. 4. 17. *Gen.* 12. 2. 3. *The Father of the Faithful.* Rom. 4. 11. *Heir of the World.* Rom. 4. 13. Which was no way true of *any Infant* that ever was Circumcised; for none had before their Circumcision such a Faith, that entituled them to such singular Promises and Prerogatives. The Scope of that place, *Rom.* 4. being to shew that *Abraham* himself was not Justified by *Works*; no not by *Circumcision*, but by *Faith*, which he had *long before he was Circumcised*, and so but a Seal or Confirmation of that Faith which he had *before*; and to assure him of the Truth of those special Promises *then* made to him.

So that though Circumcision is rightly termed by the Apostle, *A Seal of the Righteousness of* Abraham's *Faith*, which *he had yet being Uncircumcised*; of which see further *p.* 51. 52. 53. but more especially from *p.* 205 to *p.* 206. Yet the Scripture no where affirms that so it was to *any others*; neither indeed could it be a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith to *Infants* that had *no Faith*; Besides, diverse others, who as it appears from the Scriptures, were utterly destitute of that Saving Grace: For some were Circumcised, to whom *no Promise* in the Covenant made with *Abraham* did *belong*. Of *Ishmael* GOD had said that *His Covenant was not to be Established with him, but with* Isaac; and yet he was Circumcised. *Gen.* 17. 20, 21, 25. *Rom.* 9. 7, 8, 9. *Gal.* 4. 29, 30. The like may be said of *Esau*. Together with which it must be considered; *That all that were in* Abraham's *House, whether Strangers bought with Money, or Born in his House, though not of his Seed, were to be Circumcised*: To whom nevertheless, none of the Promises of that Covenant were made, as is plain

from *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 20, 21, 23, 27. So that as far as appears to us from the Scriptures, Circumcision was a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith only to *Abraham*, not so to the rest; as all the *Jews* also were not called the Fathers of the Faithful, or the Fathers of many Nations, as *Abraham* was.

Secondly, Neither is *Baptism* more than *Circumcision*, called a *Seal*. It is indeed called a *Figure*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. And it is a *Sign* also; but a Sign and Figure proper only to *Men of Understanding*; not as Circumcision, which was a Sign not Improper for *Infants*, because it left a signal Impression upon their Flesh to be remembred all their Days: But so cannot Baptism be to any Infant. To affirm Baptism therefore to be a Seal of the Covenant of Grace is groundless; for that is the peculiar Work and Office of the Holy Spirit. *Eph.* 1. 13. and 4. 30. And since neither hath GOD any where *Commanded* Infants to be Baptized, the denial therefore of Baptism to Infants, cannot be the denial of any Priviledge *due* unto them.

Object. 7. But Circumcision was Administred to Believers, as Believers, and to their Seed after them as such; to which Baptism was to correspond.

We Answer; That Circumcision was an Ordinance, which by the Institution, belonged to all the Natural Lineage and Posterity of *Abraham*, good or bad, without any such Limitation as was put upon Baptism; *If thou Believest with all thine Heart thou mayst*. *Acts* 8. Or any such Qualification that an Infant capable to receive it must of necessity have a *Believing Parent*: For we know that the Servants Born in *Abraham's* House, and Strangers Bought with Money, were also to be Circumcised, as well as those proceeding from *Abraham's* Loins; who yet surely could not pretend *to be all of them the Offspring of Believing Parents*: Which clearly shews, that Circumcision was not Administred to *Believers* as *Believers*, and to their Seed after them as *such*: But though the *Natural* Posterity of *Abraham*, whether they were Believers or no, were to be *Circumcised*, because *God* had so *Commanded it*; yet this was not sufficient for their Admission to *Baptism*. The main Plea indeed of the Jews in *John's* time was, That *they had* Abraham *to their Father*; But notwithstanding this he rejects them, and bids them bring forth *Fruits meet for Repentance*, as that which alone would give them Admission to the *Baptism of Repentance*. And if you say that this concerns the *Adult* only; We say that it concerns *Infants* as much; who are *uncapable* of that *Faith* and *Repentance* which the Gospel every where requires in those to be *Baptized*.

From

From what hath been already said therefore, it clearly appears that the *not Baptizing Infants* makes not *our Priviledge* under the *Gospel* less than theirs under the *Law*, to which *Circumcision* was annexed, inasmuch as they were not Circumcised because they were the Children of *Believers*, but because GOD had *Commanded* it; neither were they by Circumcision Sealed with a *New Covenant Seal*, as being thereby Interessed in the Mercies of God's *New and Everlasting Covenant*; many being then Circumcised, as *Ishmael* and others who had no right or title at all thereunto: But they were Circumcised by the *Command of God*, to distinguish them from the Nations, and to keep that Line clear from whence Christ. according to the Flesh should come; and to oblige them to keep the Law, *&c.* but no such thing in the Gospel. The Body and *Substance* being come, the *shadow* was to vanish and pass away. No common Father now but *Christ*; and *if Christ then* Abraham's *Seed, and Heirs according to Promise*. No Birth Priviledge but the New Birth: therefore to go back to the National Birth Priviledge, is so far from being a *Priviledge*, th at it is a *Bondage* rather; and no other than to return to the Type and Shadow, the Anti-type and Substance being come.

Neither ought such a thing to be any more esteemed the loss of a *Priviledge*, than our not enjoying litterally a Holy Land, City, Temple, a Succession of a High Priest, and a Priest-hood, by Generation, or Lineal Descent, as it was with them; since all these Types are Spiritualized to us the *Believers* under the Gospel, who are now the Holy Nation, City, Temple, and Royal Priest-hood; being all Church Members by *Regeneration*, not *Natural Generation*. And therefore we are so far from being Losers by the Bargain, that as far as *Christ* exceeds *Moses* and *Aaron*; the Gospel the Law; the Anti-type the Type; the Spiritual Birth the Carnal; and the extent of all Nations the Confines of *Judea*: so far are we *better*, and not *worse* than they.

Obj. 8. But since by the express Command of God, the Jewish Infants were Circumcised: Are not our Infants as *capable* of answering *the ends of Christian Baptism*, as theirs of *Circumcision*?

Reply. This is a true and a satisfactory Answer, that they are not: Forasmuch as the *Profession of a saving Faith* is expressly required in order to *Baptism*. Mark 16. 16. Act. 8. 37. And in like manner, *Repentance* upon the same Account, *Mat.* 3. 7, 8. *Act.* 2. 38. Whereas neither of them were at all required, whether of *Children*, or *others*, in Order to *Circumcision*. *Abraham*, 'tis true, in his own Person, *received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, which he had being Uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that be-*

believe, whether Circumcised or no: But it follows not, that because thus it was with *Abraham, the Father of the Faithful*; that therefore it was either a Sign or Seal of the Righteousness of Faith unto *others*: For as Faith was no where *required* in Order to the Admission of any to a participation thereof; so it is as plain, that for the greatest part of the Subjects of that Ordinance, they were according to ordinary Rule *utterly uncapable* thereof; such as were *Infants of Eight Days Old*. And as for *others*, who were then to be Circumcised, that were of *Age*, there is sufficient Evidence in the Scripture, that they were many of them, not only destitute of the *inward Habits* of that saving Grace; but for ought as we find, did not make so much as any *Profession* thereof: For not only were *believing Proselytes* to be admitted to that Ordinance; but *Strangers bought with Money also*, whether *Proselyted* to the Jewish Religion *or no*, *Gen.* 17. 30. So that since it is evident that a Profession of Faith and Repentance is indispensibly required under the Gospel of all that are to be admitted to *Baptism*; which was not at all required, neither of *Children*, or those at *Age*, in Order to *Circumcision*; from hence it plainly follows, that our Infants are not as capable of *Baptism* as theirs of *Circumcision*. And there being no *Institution* in the whole *New Testament* in reference to Baptism; but what concerns such only as are *so qualified*, which Infants are *uncapable of*; we cannot therefore but reckon it a great *Prophanation* of so sacred an *Institution* as *Baptism* is; upon an *ungrounded* Supposition of *Analogy* or Proportion between *that* and *Circumcision*, to proceed to an answerable *Practice*, without a *Divine Warrant*.

Obj. 9. If this be so, then how doth *the Blessing of* Abraham *come on the Gentiles*, according to *Gal.* 3. 14. which blessing of *Abraham* was, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed.* Gen. 17. 7.

In this Objection it is supposed; that if the Infants of believing Gentiles are not to be *Baptized*; then neither can they pretend to any share in the *Blessing of* Abraham, mentioned, *Gal.* 3. 14. *Gen.* 17. 7.

To which we Reply. *First*, That it follows not that because the *Carnal* Seed of *Abraham*, had a day wherein they were Priviledged under *Circumcision*; that therefore the *Carnal* Seed of every Believer should in the *Gospel Day* be admitted into the visible Priviledges of *the Sons and Heirs of Christ*. It is a very undue Supposition, that the Proportion between *Abraham* in the Flesh, and his Carnal Seed, in the time when Circumcision *was in date*; should be the same to *Abraham* in the Spirit (who is Christ) and the Carnal Seed of every Believer, in that season when Circumcision is *out of date*.

Se-

Secondly, If we will know what is this Seed of *Abraham*, to whom God doth here promiſe to be a God; according to the Letter indeed *Abraham* obtained the Bleſſing and Priviledges of the whole Inheritance which came by the *Law*, to be the peculiar Inheritance of himſelf, *his Fleſhly Seed and Family*; together, with all the ſingular Advantages, which thereby were miniſtred among them, for calling and gathering a Seed unto Chriſt in an *Everlaſting Covenant*; whereunto *that* Covenant in which they ſtood, under *Circumciſion*, with the Prerogatives of the Inheritance thereof, did Miniſter as an *Example*, *Figure*, and *Shadow*. The Sum of the Covenant of Circumciſion, See *Gen.* 17. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee: Every Man Child among you ſhall be Circumciſed*, unto ver. 15. That Circumciſion was part of the Law is plain. *John* 7. 23. And that it obliged all that were under it to the keeping of the whole Law, is alſo as evident, *Gal.* 5. 3. That the Law was a Covenant Miniſtring as an *Example*, *Figure*, *and Shadow of Heavenly Things*, to wit, *of the Sanctuary*, *and of the true Tabernacle*, whereof Chriſt alone was the *High Prieſt and Miniſter*. See *Heb.* 8. 1, 2. 5. *Chap.* 9. *Verſ.* 1. 9. *Chap.* 10. *Verſ.* 1. That the Covenant of Circumciſion fell with the Law. See *Act.* 15. 24. *Subverting your Souls, ſaying, you muſt be Circumciſed, and keep the Law.* As alſo, *Col.* 2. 14. In this Senſe, *the Bleſſing* of Abraham was not to come upon the Gentiles; neither conſequently the *Birth-Priviledge*, which had its Inſtitution from that Covenant only, and was a principal part of the Bleſſing thereby given.

Thirdly; The Bleſſing therefore of *Abraham*, in the Myſtery, and according to the Goſpel, is the Manifeſtation of Jeſus Chriſt, with all the Bleſſings of the Everlaſting Covenant, to be the peculiar Priviledge, Inheritance, and Right of every true Believer; who therefore are called the Children of *Abraham*, that the Type, and the Subſtance, having a mutual, and reſpective Application each to other, the mind of God might be clearly ſeen in them both, for the diſtinguiſhing of *Shadows* and *Figures*; which were to be *done away* from the *Subſtance*, that was not capable of any *Change*. Which we are manifeſtly inſtructed in by the Apoſtle. *Gal.* 3. 26. *Ye are all the Children of God by Faith in Chriſt*; *Jew*, *Greek*, Bond, Free, Male, Female. Mark ye how the Apoſtle reſolves the point in Queſtion, at Verſe 29. *And if ye be Chriſt's, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promiſe*; not if ye be the Seed of Believers, then are ye *Abrahams* Seed; as is ſuggeſted. And this is the Bleſſing of *Abraham* which was to come on the *Gentiles*, even this, that Chriſt with all his Benefits, ſhould be given to the Believing *Gentiles* for a Covenant.

Obj.

Objection 10. Then how can Believers be Heirs according to the Promise. *Gal.* 3, 29. If their Children should be Excluded from the Promise: For the *Childrens* right to the Promise, is a part of the *Fathers* Inheritance: For the Promise unto *Abraham* was; *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee.*

We Answer; *First*, That we know of none that do affirm, that the Children of Believers are *Excluded from the Promise.* But this we say; That as the Denial of Infants Baptism, imports *no Exclusion* from the Promise; so neither doth every *Right* to the Promise; *Instate* a Person into the Inheritance. The *Jew* had a *Right* to the Promise, uncalled. *First*, As God had his Remnant among them, according to *Election.* *Secondly*, He had a Right to the Promise, as God gave him a *Priority*, and *Precedency* in the tenders of the Promise above and before all other People. *Thirdly*, They had a right to the Promise, as they were *lost Sinners*, whom Christ *came to seek and to save.* But in neither of these Respects, was the *Jew* an *Heir in the Promise*: Such an Interest and Right to the Promise, declares the Person to be a Son by Adoption. And *if Sons, then Heirs of God through Christ.* Gal. 4. 7. a Priviledge which no title to the natural Father could ever prefer a Creature unto, whether under the Gospel Administration, or before.

Secondly, The Scripture made use of for Infants Baptism in this Objection, is this. *If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed and Heirs according to the Promise.* How plainly doth this Scripture lay the Title of the Heir upon this conditional Qualification of being *Christ's?* And he that is Christs, is an Heir by this Text, be the Children never so great Aliens and Strangers.

Thirdly, It is said, that the Childrens right to the Promise, is part of the Fathers Inheritance: *For the Promise is to thee, and to thy Seed*; whereby is intended, that if the *Father* be *Christ's*, and so cometh to be an Heir, then the Promise carrieth the same Title of the Inheritance down to the *Children*; that is, if the *Father* be a Son of *Abraham*, (which in Gospel Construction, is a Believer) then the Child must be a Son of *Abraham*, and a Believer also, even by his *Birth Priviledge*; directly contronting many Scriptures, which restrain the Blessing of Sonship to *Abraham*, and the Inheritance in all manner of Persons, to Faith in Christ; *Gal.* 3. 9. *They which are of Faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham.* Not they which are the Children of Believers. And in the Text alledged; *If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed*; not if ye be the Children of Believers.

Fourthly, As to the Interpretation of that Passage, taken from *Ver.* 16. *The Promise is to Abraham and his Seed*: Besides what hath been

said

ſaid in Anſwer to the foregoing Objection: It ought to be duely conſidered, that the Covenant of Grace, or the Goſpel Covenant which God made with believing *Abraham*, before his Removal out of his own Countrey; *Gen.* 12. 1, 2. was not made with *Believers and their Seed*; but with *Abraham and his Seed*. *In thy Seed*, ſaith the Text, *ſhall all the Nations of the Earth be bleſſed*, Gen. 22. 18. compared with *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. *In thy Seed*, that is, *Chriſt*. For ſo the Apoſtle tells us expreſly, *That to Abraham and to his Seed, were the Promiſes made; He ſaith not unto Seeds, as of many; but as of one; and to thy Seed, which is Chriſt*, Gal 3. 16. So that all Goſpel Promiſes run directly to Chriſt the Inheriting Seed. To him they are made. In him do they all center, and in him alone, all the Bleſſings in Promiſe are to be communicated to all his Members.

'Tis true in the Covenant of Circumciſion which God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. which was a legal conditional Covenant: As God doth therein promiſe to be a God unto *Abraham*, ſo he had alſo a Noble Seed, to whom the Bleſſings therein promiſed as an Inheritance, did inure: But under this Qualification, as they were his *Natural Seed*, priviledged under that Typical Adminiſtration, by which this Prerogative was ſo ſetled. Now to improve this aright, the Heavenly *Myſtery* vailed in this Diſpenſation, muſt be ſought out: For although *Abraham* ſtood a common Father under the Law; yet Chriſt is the only Father, *the Everlaſting Father* under the Goſpel Adminiſtration. And this *Anceſtour* hath alſo his Seed more nobly deſcended than the *Natural* Seed of *Abraham*; being all the Sons of God by *Faith in Chriſt*, ver. 16. Yea it is impoſſible, that by any other Qualification, men can come to be the Sons of this *Anceſtour*, than by being made one with him in the Participation of the Everlaſting Grace of the Unchangeable Covenant. Now then it is an incompetent Application of Perſons, to compare every particular Believer and his Children, to *Abraham*, the common Anceſtour of a whole Adminiſtration, and the Seed priviledged thereby. And no leſs incompetent is the Application of the Qualification, requiſite in Perſons to be accounted Heirs; that becauſe it ſufficed to *Abraham*'s Heirs, that they were the Sons of his *Natural* Generation, and that they were thereby made capable of an Inheritance in the *Figure* and *Letter*; That therefore it ſufficeth by being the Child, according to *Natural* Generation of any Believer, to be upon that account an *Heir of God*, and joint Heir with Chriſt, in the very *Subſtance* and *Myſtery*, which the former Adminiſtration did *Prefigure*. Upon the whole then, as to this; We ſay, that it is no right Reaſoning to infer or ſuppoſe, that the Infants of Believers, are Joynt Heirs with Chriſt and their godly Parents, under the Adminiſtration of *Grace*; becauſe of the Birth Priviledge given to *Abraham* and his Seed, by the *Law*.

Obj.

Objection 11. Thoſe to whom the Goſpel Covenant belonged, to them the Seal thereof appertained: But to Believers and their Seed, the Goſpel Covenant belonged. *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed*; therefore to them the Seal thereof did appertain: For the *Faderati*, were to be *Signati*; that is, thoſe that were in Covenant, were to have the Seal thereof. *Gen.* 17. 10. By way of Conſequence therefore it naturally follows; that if Circumciſion, the Seal of the Goſpel Covenant, belonged to the Seed of Believers under the Law; then doth the Goſpel Seal Baptiſm, much more appertain to the Seed of Believers now.

To this we Reply; *Firſt*, That there is no natural Conſequence at all from this Scripture, to infer the Baptizing of Infants; nor any ground to build the Goſpel Ordinance, Baptiſm, upon the command of the legal Ordinance, Circumciſion; as hath been already manifeſted by what we have ſaid in our Anſwers, to ſeveral of the foregoing Objections; wherein it hath alſo been made evident, that neither the one, nor the other are Repreſented in the Scripture, as the common Seals of the New Covenant; that being the peculiar Office of the Holy Spirit. *Eph.* 1. 13. We ſhall therefore in Anſwer to the preſent Objection, take occaſion, more particularly to conſider the Nature and Scope of the Covenant God made with *Abraham*, in the Text alledged. *Gen.* 17. 7. And therein to enquire, whether the New Covenant made with Believers under the Goſpel, and that be one and the ſame? In order to the Reſolution whereof, we muſt underſtand, that as *Abraham* by Promiſe ſtood in a double Capacity; *viz. Firſt*, As he was a natural Father unto the *Jews*, who proceeded from him in a courſe of Natural Generation. *Secondly*, As he was a Spiritual Father; in which reſpect he was the Father of many Nations. comprehending the Spiritual *Iſrael*, whether Jews or Gentiles throughout the World: So accordingly, the Promiſes made unto *Abraham*, were of two ſorts; ſome reſpecting his Natural Seed; whether Domeſtick or National, which were Typical of the Spiritual; as the Birth of *Iſaac*; the Deliverance of his Poſterity out of *Egypt*; the poſſeſſing of the Land of *Canaan*, with many other temporal Bleſſings and Benefits, Annexed thereunto. And others again reſpecting in a peculiar manner, the Spiritual Seed, the Family of the Faithful, the Elect, of whom through Chriſt he was the Father; and which are Evangelical, belonging in an eſpecial manner to the Goſpel Covenant; As *Gen.* 17. 5. *I have made thee a Father of many Nations.* And that which we find, *Gen.* 15. 5. *So ſhall thy Seed be.* In which it is promiſed, That there ſhould be of the Nations innumerable, that ſhould be *Abrahams* Seed by believing. *Rom.* 4. 17, 18.

18. And again it was an Evangelical Promiſe that we find, *Gen.* 12. 3. and *Gen.* 18. 18. *And in thy Seed ſhall all the Families of the Earth be Bleſſed.* For in theſe is promiſed a Bleſſing to Believers, of whom *Abraham* is Father. *Gal.* 3. 8, 9. And by Chriſt who is the Seed of *Abraham. Gal.* 3. 16.

And therefore *Secondly*; It is of great moment in the preſent Caſe, rightly to diſtinguiſh, and truly to apply the ſeveral Promiſes God made unto *Abraham*, according to their proper Subjects: It being evident from what hath been already ſaid, that though under the Domeſtick, or National Promiſes to *Abraham*, peculiar to him and his Poſterity by *Sarah*, Spiritual Bleſſings in Chriſt were ſhadowed; yet Circumciſion was not a Token to every one Circumciſed, that the Promiſes, whether National or Spiritual, did belong to him. Nor was Intereſt in the Covenant, the Adequate, Formal, or proper Reaſon of the Circumciſing of them: For *Iſhmael* was Circumciſed, and others were to be Circumciſed, to whom none of the Promiſes in that Covenant were made; as is plain from *Gen.* 17. 21. *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Gal.* 4. 28, 29. It is no good Argument therefore, to ſay they were in the Covenant; therefore to be Circumciſed: For Females were in the Covenant, yet not to be Circumciſed. Nor on the other ſide, Males were to be Circumciſed; therefore they were in the Covenant: For *Iſhmael* and others were to be Circumciſed, yet not in the Covenant. Whereby 'tis plain, that the true Reaſon why any were Circumciſed, was the *Command*, not *Intereſt in the Covenant.* Much leſs is it true that is ſuggeſted by ſome; *That Children are to be Baptized by Vertue of the Promiſe, firſt to the Parents, as Believers, and in them, to their Seed as ſubordinates:* For beſides that, there is no ſuch Promiſe in Scripture, that God will be a God to every Believer, and his natural Seed: So the Rule of Baptizing, either Parents or Children, is not Intereſt in the Promiſe, by God's Promiſe to them: But their Profeſſion of Faith, or being actual Diſciples of Chriſt, whom alone Chriſt hath appointed to be Baptized.

Thirdly, As to what concerns the Covenant of Grace therefore, or the Goſpel Covenant, which according to the foregoing Argument, is ſaid to be now made with Believers and their Seed, as the ground of their Admiſſion to Baptiſm: We muſt know that the Covenant of Grace is to be conſidered, either in reſpect of the Promiſes of Eternal Life, made to all the Elect in Chriſt, the which remains one and the ſame in all Ages, though variouſly Adminiſtred in the times of the Old and New Teſtament, or elſe in reſpect of the manner of its Adminiſtration.

For if the Covenant be underſtood in the firſt ſence of the Promiſe of Eternal Life and Salvation, made to the Elect in Chriſt; That

That did never belong to all the Children born of Believing Parents, as hath been already Inſtanced in *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*, &c. but only ſuch as are Elected of them. *Rom.* 9. 7, 8, 9. *Neither becauſe they are the Seed of Abraham, are they all Children*, &c. The Covenant of Grace being firſt made between God and Chriſt, and all the Elect in Chriſt. And therefore in Scripture it is called, *The Promiſe of Eternal Life, which was made to the Elect before the World began*; who are therefore called, the *Heirs of Promiſe*. Which Promiſe, had its firſt Promulgation to *Adam*, in the Garden of Paradiſe; where we have alſo the firſt Diſcovery of the Myſtery of the two Seeds. Now the Covenant of Grace in this Senſe, is not the Ground and Reaſon of Adminiſtring Ordinances to any Perſon whatſoever: But the Law of Inſtitution only, is the Ground and Reaſon of viſible Adminiſtrations; For the Adminiſtration of Ordinances, belongs not to the ſubſtance of the Covenant; but depends meerly upon the Law of Inſtitution, without any other Conſideration. And hence we find, that from the firſt Promulgation of the Covenant to *Adam*, until God made the Covenant of Circumciſion with *Abraham*, there was no Ordinance to be adminiſtred to Infants: Though ſome Infants as well as grown Perſons, both of Believers and Unbelievers, might be comprehended in the Covenant: Yet not to be Circumciſed; and ſo not to be Baptized, for want of an Inſtitution. So the Promiſe, *Acts* 2. 39. is ſaid to be to them afar off, in the preſent tenſe, while uncalled: And yet not to be Baptized before calling, unleſs you will Baptize Gentiles in profeſſed Gentiliſm. And ſo the Jews; ſome not yet born, ſome not called, have the Promiſe of God made to them. *Rom.* 11. 27. *For this is my Covenant unto them, when I ſhall take away their Sins.* And yet they are not to be Baptized 'til Converted. Nor indeed can the Covenant, conſidered in its pure Nature, be a Miniſters Rule to Adminiſter Ordinances by, ſeeing it is unknown who are in the Covenant, and who are not: But that which is their Rule muſt be ſomething that is manifeſt.

As for the External Adminiſtration of the Covenant, as you have already heard, that hath varied in ſeveral Ages, according to the Will of the Law-giver: for during all that period of time, from *Adam* to *Abraham*, there was no Ordinance to be Adminiſtred to Infants. In *Abraham*'s time indeed, Circumciſion was Inſtituted, which Ordinance belongs peculiarly to the *Old Teſtament Adminiſtration*, and was part of *Moſes*'s Law, which is now Abrogated and done away. And this was the firſt Ordinance that was Adminiſtred to Infants; and not to all Infants, but only to Male Infants, Living in *Abraham*'s Family, if they did Live to the *Eighth* Day; otherwiſe they had no right to this Ordinance, though many of them doubtleſs in the Covenant of Grace, and ſo Saved. So we ſay of Infants in the Days of

the

the Gospel, many of them are in the Covenant of Grace, and so Saved by Virtue of the Free Promise: But yet not to be Baptized, if they do not Live to the *time* of Believing and Repenting, the only time appointed for Baptism: So that the Administration of Ordinances to Infants depends upon the Law of Institution only, and not upon their being in Covenant.

Fourthly; In this respect therefore it ought to be duly considered, as hath been before Observed; That the Covenant of Grace, or the Gospel Covenant, which Believers are now under, (whereof Christ is the alone and only Mediator) was not made with *Believers and their Seed*, but *with Abraham and his Seed*; that is *Christ*: For so the Apostle tells us expressly; That *to Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made*; *He saith not unto Seeds as many, but as of one: And to thy Seed which is Christ*. So that all Gospel Promises run to Christ, the Inheriting Seed; To Him they are made; In Him do they all center; and from Him alone are all the Blessings in Promise to be derived unto all His Members.

'Tis true; In the Covenant of Circumcision, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. (which was a Legal Bondage Covenant, and therefore now repealed, as shall be afterward shewn) God doth indeed therein promise to be a GOD to *Abraham* and his Fleshly Seed; and to give them the Land of *Canaan* for an Inheritance. And their Obedience to Circumcision is expressly called the Covenant on their Part. *Gen.* 17. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between Me and you, and thy Seed after thee*; *Every Man-Child among you shall be Circumcised*. So *Acts* 7. 8. *And he gave them the Covenant of Circumcision*; *and so* Abraham *begat* Isaac, *and Circumcised him the Eighth Day*. By which they stood engaged to keep all those other Additional Ordinances which *Moses* gave them, when they were about to enter their Promised Inheritance. *Gal.* 5, 3. *For I testifie that whosoever is Circumcised, he is a Debtor to do the whole Law*. But the Covenant of Grace which God made with Believing *Abraham* before his departure out of his own Countrey (and therefore long before the Covenant of Circumcision was in being) runs in another strain. For therein as GOD *freely* Promiseth to Bless *Abraham* himself; so he doth as *freely* Promise to *make him a Blessing*: For that *in him*, that is, *in his Seed*, Christ, *should all the Families of the Earth be Blessed*. Gen. 12. 2, 3. And this was a Covenant of Grace *indeed*; a Covenant that was *purely Evangelical*; every way *Extensive* and *Absolute*, and therefore unchangeable: For therein God hath *freely* Promised a Blessing unto *all sorts* of true Believers, whether Jews or Gentiles; in giving unto them an *Eternal Inheritance*. Heb. 9. 15. *Incorruptible and Undefiled, that fadeth not away, Purchased by the Blood of Jesus, and reserved in Heaven for them*; of which the *Earthly Inheritance* in the

Land of *Canaan* was a *Type*. So that as there was a two-fold Covenant made with *Abraham*, a Covenant of *Grace*, and a Covenant of *Works*: So there is a two-fold *Seed* of *Abraham*, a *Fleshly* and a *Spiritual*, Typed out by *Ishmael* and *Isaac*; and a two-fold *Inheritance*, an *Earthly* and a *Heavenly*. But the *Heavenly* Inheritance was not given to the *Fleshly* Seed, but only in *Types* offered to them; and confirmed only to the *Spiritual* Seed, whether Jews or Gentiles; who in that respect are called the *Heirs of Promise*; yet not immediately, or at first hand rate, but through the *Mediation* of Christ alone, *in whom all the Families of the Earth are Blessed*. For as *Ishmael* the Child of the Flesh had no right with *Isaac* in the outward *Typical* Promise; so *Isaac* himself by vertue of his *fleshly* descent, had no right nor interest in the *Heavenly* Inheritance. *Rom.* 9. 7. any otherwise, than as he came to have an *Interest in Christ*. And therefore we find the Apostle expounding the Word of Promise; sheweth that the Evangelical Promises made to *Abraham*, were not made to any ones Fleshly Seed; no not with the meer Fleshly Seed of Believing *Abraham* himself; but these Promises did all run to Christ the Inheriting Seed, to whom they were made; and when Christ was come they all centre in Him. *Now to Abraham and his Seed* (saith the Text) *were the Promises made. He saith not unto Seeds as of many, but as of One; and to thy Seed, which is Christ.* In whom all the Promises of the Gospel, *are Yea and Amen.*

Fifthly: Having thus followed the Promises down from *Abraham* unto CHRIST; let us now see to whom they come forth again, and it is not to any ones *Fleshly* Seed whatsoever; but from Christ they all Flow forth again to *Believers*, and only to *Believers*; and that by vertue of their *union* with Christ. To this purpose the Apostle tells us; That *if we be CHRIST's, then are we Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise*; There being no way to partake of the Promise, but by *Faith in Christ*. Gal. 3. 22. *The Scripture hath concluded all under Sin, that the Promise by Faith of* Jesus Christ *might be given to them that Believe*. So that all the Promises run to Christ, and from Him Flow forth again only to Believers; not to them and their *Natural Off-spring*, as is Suggested, further than they are *Believers* also in their *own Persons*: For no otherwise was it with the *Fleshly Seed* of Believing *Abraham* himself. Which being Impartially Consider'd, is a full Answer to all Arguments drawn from the Covenant, and the the Promises made to *Abraham*; and certainly, and unavoidably cuts off *Infants Church-member ship* in the Days of the Gospel (unless you can find a new Institution for it;) and consequently it leaves no room for *Infants Baptism*; unless it can be proved that all the Infants of Believers, are *Heirs of Abraham's Faith*, Believing as he did: and that the Promises are theirs, not by *Application* or *Analogy*, but *directly*

really and *properly*; and by their own *Personal* Faith: Which the Scriptures do no where Affirm.

And indeed so to Assert, would be not only contradictory to the Scriptures; which tell us *that we are all Children of Wrath by Nature*: But to all former and latter *Experience*. Then would Grace be a *Birth Privilege*; and *Regeneration* tied to a *Natural Generation*. Then must all the Posterity of *Believers* be *Saved*; unless that Doctrine be true, that *Men may fall from Grace*. Then must we tie up and restrain the Grace of God's Covenant to the Children of *Believers* only; and then what Hope for the Posterity of *Unbelievers*? Contrary to the Experience of all Ages; whilst Grace was extended to the *Gentiles*, who were not the Off-spring of *Believers*; when the *Natural* Branches the Children of *Believing Abraham* were cut off.

Sixthly. Whereas you tell us; That all those that were *Federati* were to be *Signati*; that is, all those that were in the *Covenant*, were to have the *Seal* thereof. *Gen.* 17. 10. And that therefore it naturally follows, that if *Circumcision* the Seal of the *Gospel* Covenant belonged to the Seed of Believers under the *Law*; Then doth *Baptism* much more appertain to the Seed of Believers under the *Gospel*. We Reply, by denying the Consequence of the Argument: For though it should be granted that the Covenant of *Circumcision*, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. is indeed a *Gospel Covenant*; and that all the Infants of Believers are therein *comprehended* with their Parents; Yet it follows not that they are therefore to have the *Seal* thereof. For the *consequence* must be proved from this *Universal*; All that are in Covenant must be Sealed: Which is not true. If it were true, it must be so either by Reason of some necessary Connexion between the Terms, which is none: For it is but a common Accident to a Man that hath a Promise or a Covenant made to him, that he should have a special *Sign* for the confirmation thereof; It may be present or absent from the Subject. God made a *Special Promise* to *Joshua*, that he should bring *Israel* into the Land of *Canaan*: To *Phineas a Covenant of an Everlasting Priest-hood*, without any *special Sign or Seal* distinct from the *Covenant*. Or else it must be so by reason of *GOD's Will* declared concerning the *Covenant of Grace*: But that is not true. The *Promise* made to *Adam*, which was the same in substance with the *Covenant of Grace*, had no special *Sign* or *Seal* annexed to it. *Noah* and *Abel* were within the Covenant of Grace; yet no special Sign appointed them. Therefore it is not God's Will that *all* that are in the Covenant must be Sealed; If they had, it had been *Will Worship*, God not appointing it to them. And if you say, All that are in Covenant *since Abraham's time*, should be *Sealed*: But neither is that certain; since we find no such thing concerning *Melchesidek* and *Lot*, that Lived in *Abraham's* time; nor concerning *Job*, that its conceiv-

ed lived after his time. You will say, but it is true of those that were in Covenant in *Abraham's Family*: But neither is that true: For Male Children *before the eighth day*, and *Women* though in Covenant, yet were not to be Sealed. So that you see it is so far from being universally true, that all that are in Covenant must be *Sealed*, that this is all which is true. *All the Male Children of* Abraham's *Family, if they were eight days old, must be signed with the Sign of Circumcision*; which will never be able to prove the *Consequence* of the Argument; That therefore *All* the Children of Believers, Males, or Females must be *Baptized*, unless there were an *Express Command*, or *Example* in the New Testament, signifying God's mind unto us therein.

The Covenant of Grace was Ratified and Confirmed unto *Abraham*, a considerable time before the Covenant of Circumcision was given to him, *viz.* about twenty five years before it; and had then no outward Sign or Seal annexed thereunto. And indeed that which hath been of late affirmed; *That the Covenant of Grace always had an Outward Sign or Seal added to it*. is so wide a Mistake, that on the contrary it may be affirmed; That although the Efficacy of its Grace, did reach Believers in all Ages; yet it was not filled up with Ordinances of Worship proper and peculiar to it self, until the times of Reformation; nor had till then any outward Sign or Token, immediately belonging thereunto: For had it been so, this Sign or Token, as the Covenant it self, had remained without change, and not vanished away with the other Shadows of the *Mosaical* Oeconomy. Mr. *Cox* in his Discourse of the Covenants, *p.* 83, 84.

If it be said; That though the Sign of Circumcision was *Actually applyed* only to the *Males*; yet it must be understood, that the *Females* were *virtually* Circumcised *in them*, as the Nobler Sex. We answer, That the Conclusion to be proved, is, that Infants are to be Sealed *Actually*; not *Virtually*: For if a *Virtual* Sealing, or Baptizing, were all that you would prove we might grant it, we may say, Infants are virtually baptized in their Parents, and yet it may be unlawful to Baptize them *Actually*, as it would have been unlawful to have Circumcised Women *Actually*, (had they been capable thereof) notwithstanding their *Virtual* Circumcision: For it had been a *Will-Worship*, there being no *Command* to do it. And indeed to speak exactly; Women were not Circumcised *Virtually* in the Males: For he is said *Virtually* to have a thing by another, as by a *Proxy* or Attorney, that might receive it by *himself*; yet according to the Effect of Law, *another*'s receiving it, is as if *he* had received it: But so the *Males* did not receive Circumcision for the *Females*; For the Females had they been capable, might not be Circumcised in their *own Persons*: It had been their Sin if they had received it, God not appointing it; as it had been a Sin for a Child to be Circumcised

before

before or after the eighth day, in them that altered or ſwerved from the Appointment of God. So that the Concluſion remains yet to be proved, that all the Infants of Believing Parents are to be *Actually* Signed, or Sealed by the Ordinance of *Baptiſm*, unto which you give the term of the *Goſpel Seal*. For as there is no *Command* for the ſame in the New Teſtament; nor any *Example* that may give hint unto us, of the mind of God therein: So neither can it be proved by any juſt *Analogy* or *Proportion*, between *that* and *Circumciſion*. Together with which it muſt be conſidered, that there are other ſigns of the Covenant, beſides *Baptiſm*: As *Circumciſion*, and the Paſs over of old, ſo the Lord's Supper now. If then we ſhould grant the Concluſion in general, that the Infants of Believers are to be *Signed*; yet you would ſay, they are not to be Partakers of the *Lord's Supper*, becauſe it is not appointed for them: So in like manner, it follows not that they are to be Baptized, unleſs you can prove that it is appointed to them. And indeed there is as much reaſon for the *one*, as for the *other*: For if we muſt *Examine our ſelves* before we be admitted to the *one*; which you ſay Infants *cannot do*: So *Faith and Repentance* are required as the Condition of the *other*, which Infants are as *uncapable of*; and therefore cannot be duely admitted to *either*, without ſome Expreſs, ſignifying God's Mind unto us therein. For though it may be good to argue thus; *It is God's Mind, therefore it is to be done*; yet it is too much for us to argue, *This ſhould be, and therefore God hath appointed it*; Inaſmuch, as no *Reaſon* of *ours*, in *Poſitive* Worſhip, ſuch as *Baptiſm* is, but *God's Will* alone, gathered by ſome *Expreſs Command*, or *Example* in the *New Teſtament*, can acquit an Action ſo performed from the Guilt of *Will-Worſhip*.

Seventhly, Whereas you conceive that *Circumciſion* and *Baptiſm* are appointed by God, as common *Seals* of the New Covenant; this is affirmed without Proof: For no where doth the Scripture give that Character to them; that being the peculiar Work or Office of the Holy Spirit, as hath been already proved. 'Tis true, *Abraham*'s Circumciſion in his own Perſon, is by the Apoſtle *Rom* 4. 11. Termed, *A Seal of the Righteouſneſs of the Faith which he had yet being Uncircumciſed, that he might be the Father of all them that believe*. But ſo it cannot be ſaid of Infants that had no Faith; much leſs could any of them pretend to that Prerogative that *Abraham* had. Indeed, from hence to conclude that Circumciſion was appointed by God, as a *Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith*, or of the Covenant of Grace, to the Generality that were the Subjects thereof, is groundleſs: For neither *Iſaac*, nor *Jacob*, nor any beſides, had before or after their Circiſion, ſuch a Faith, which Entituled them to ſuch ſingular Promiſes. It cannot be juſtly affirmed of *Iſaac*, *Jacob*, *David*, or any of the other Patriarchs; That *they received the Sign of Circumciſion, a Seal of*

be Righteousness of the Faith which they had, yet being Uncircumcised, that they might be the Fathers of all them that believe, as it is of *Abraham*; This being a peculiar Honour, that is by the Spirit of God conferred on *Abraham* alone, and is indeed Incommunicable to any else, how famous soever for Faith and Holiness; much less can it be affirmed of the Generality of the Jewish Infants, that were the ordinary Subjects of Circumcision. We deny not, that the Circumcision of others than *Abraham*, was a *Token* (as the Spirit of God himself expressly terms it) of the Covenant then made with *Abraham*: But it doth not therefore follow, that every ones Circumcision was to him a *Seal of his Right, to any of the Promises thereof*; as it is evident in the Case of *Ishmael* and many others, the Servants born and bred in *Abraham*'s Family, and Strangers bought with Money, who were all to be Circumcised; to whom, nevertheless none of the Promises in that Covenant were made; as is plain from *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 20, 21, 23, 27. Much less was Circumcision a Seal to all that received it, of their Interest in the Righteousness of that Faith that *Abraham* had; for then they had been all saved. It was therefore intended only as the *Restipulation* of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his Seed after him, on *their Part*; or as a Sign or Token of their *Duty to God*; not as a Seal of *God's Promise to them*. Gen. 17. 9. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations*. Ver. 10. *This is my Covenant* (or this is the sign of my Covenant) *which ye shall keep, every Man Child among you shall be Circumcised*. Besides it is evident, that by Circumcision, they were obliged unto a perfect and universal Obedience to the whole Revealed Will and Law of God. *Gal.* 5. 3. *For I testifie to every Man that is Circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law*. And that under the Penalty of the Curse upon the least Transgression or Disobedience. *Gal.* 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things, which are written in the Book of the Law to do them*, which perfect Obedience, was yet impossible to be performed. *Gal.* 3. 11. *Rom.* 3. 19, 20. So that Circumcision was so far from being *a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*, or of the Gospel Covenant, to the Generality that were under it, that it was rather *a Token of Servitude and Bondage*; and such *a Yoke*, that as the Apostles tell the *Jews*; *Neither they, nor their Fathers were able to bear it*. Acts 15. 10. Gal. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Which yet it had not been, had it been to them, as well as to *Abraham* himself, *a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*: For that brings with it true Christian Liberty and Freedom.

'Notwithstanding the Promises made in the Covenant of Circum-'cision, (saith Mr. *Cox* in his Discourse of the Covenants, *p.* 152, '153, 154.) and the Separation of *Israel*, to be the peculiar People 'of God, in pursuance of them; yet that Covenant did not confine

'the

'the solemn Worship of God (by Sacrifices or otherwise) to *Abra-*
'*ham's* Family: Nor were other Holy Men then living under any
'Obligation, to Incorporate themselves thereinto by Circumcision;
'or at all to take upon them that Sign, or token of that Covenant
'that God then made with *Abraham*; which yet without doubt they
'should have done, if it had been a *Seal of the Covenant of Grace:*
'For then by reason of their Interest in that Covenant, both in point
'of Duty and Priviledge, it had equally belonged unto them, as to
'the Seed and Family of *Abraham*. But from the sacred History, it
'is evident, that the command, by vertue of which Circumcision
'was Administred, extended no further than to *Abraham* and his
'Family. And therefore we have no ground to conclude, that *Lot*
'(though nearly Allied to *Abraham*) was Circumcised. Seeing there
'is nothing in the Command of God, or first Institution of Circum-
'cision that obliged him thereunto, or interested him therein, and
'yet there is no doubt to be made of his Interest in the Covenant
'of Grace. Neither was *Lot* the only Righteous Man then living in
'the World, besides those of *Abraham's* Family: For of the Patri-
'archs, *Heber*, *Salah*, and *Shem*, were then living; and as they had
'their distinct Families and Interests, so there is no question, but
'the pure Worship of God was maintained in them, and they pro-
'moted the Interest of true Religion to the utmost of their Power,
'while they lived. Yea *Melchisedech* was in being about this time,
'(whether he were *Shem* before named, or another, it concerns
'not us to determine; but this is certain, that it was he) who *was*
'*the Priest of the most High God, and King of Salem*; and in both
'these Respects, the most Eminent Type of Jesus Christ that ever
'was in the World; a Person greater than *Abraham*: For *Abra-*
'*ham paid Tythes to him, and was blessed by him.* Now considering
'that he was both King and Priest, there is no doubt but there was
'a Society of Men that were ruled by him, and for whom he Mini-
'stred: For a Priest is ordained for Men in things pertaining to God.
'And this Society was at this time, as much a Church of God, as
'*Abraham's* Family was, and as truly interested in the Covenant of
'Grace, as any therein; yet were they not concerned as Parties in
'the Covenant of Circumcision, nor to be signed thereby: From
'whence it is manifest, that Circumcision was not applied as a Seal
'of the Covenant of Grace; nor did an Interest therein render a man
'the proper subject of it.

Again; 'It is no ways difficult (saith he) to conceive, that Cir-
'cumcision might have a different Respect, according to the differing
'Circumstances and Capacity of its Subject. ——— It was to *Abra-*
'*ham a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had*, &c. But
'this arose from the peculiar and extraordinary Circumstances and

'Capacity that he was in: For it is not possible to conceive, that 'Circumcision should be a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which 'he had while Uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all 'them that believe in Uncircumcision, to one that never had Faith, 'either before or after his Circumcision, nor ever had, or should have 'the Relation of a Father to all Believers, as *Abraham* had. In which 'respect, it is equally absurd to say, that Circumcision was a Seal unto 'all its Subjects, of the Righteousness of the Faith which they had 'while Uncircumcised, as to affirm, that it was the Seal of a Pater-'nal Relation to all Believers, unto every one that received it: 'And therefore both these must necessarily be resolved into the par-'ticular Circumstances of *Abraham*; the particular Relation he had 'in the Covenants made with him, and not into the Nature of Cir-'cumcision, considered simply, and in it self. What Circumcision 'was directly, and in its immediate use, is one thing; and what it 'was as subordinate to a better Covenant and Promise, that had Pre-'cedency to it, is another. And it is easie to conceive, that it was 'that to the Father of the Faithful, in its extraordinary Institution, 'that it could not be to the Children of the Flesh, or carnal Seed, in 'its ordinary Use. *Page* 189, 190, 191. 194.

Upon the whole therefore, it clearly appears, That Circumcision was never appointed by God, as a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, or of the Gospel Covenant, to the Generality of the Subjects thereof. It was indeed a Token of the Covenant then made betwixt God and them; but a Seal only to *Abraham*, and, that in respect of *the Righteousness of the Faith, which he had, being yet Uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that believe*; which cannot be affirmed of any others. And so for Baptism; it is indeed called a *Figure*, 1 Pet. 3. 21. But a Sign or Figure proper only for men of Understanding; not as Circumcision, which was a Sign not improper for Infants, because it left a signal Impression upon their Flesh, when they came to understand the Reason of it: But so cannot Baptism be to any Infant. And indeed if Baptism be as you say it is, a Seal of being already ingrafted into Christ, and consequently into the Church; then it is a Seal only to Believers, who alone are capable thereof: Since it is by Faith that men are in Christ, and Christ in them, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Rom.* 11. 20, 29. *Eph.* 3. 17. And therefore it cannot be any Seal at all to Infants that have no Faith; But as it is evident, that a Profession of Faith is required of all to be Baptized. *Mark* 16. 16. *Act* 8. 37. which Infants are uncapable of; so it is as evident, that though Baptism is indeed a Sign or Figure of Regeneration to the Baptized. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. yet a Seal it cannot be, that being the Work which the Holy Scripture assigns unto the Holy Spirit only. *Eph.* 1. 13. *In whom also after ye believed, ye were Sealed by that Holy Spirit*

Spirit of Promiſe. And no where is it aſſigned unto Baptiſm, Beſides, as the true Seal of the Goſpel Covenant is not at all at Man's diſpoſe. *Jo.* 3. 8. as Baptiſm is, if that be it; So it is as certain, that God never ſets his Seal to a Blank: Which yet it muſt of Neceſſity follow, that he doth, if Circumciſion or Baptiſm either, were appointed by God as Seals of the Goſpel Covenant; or as Seals of their Intereſt, in the Righteouſneſs of Faith, to whom ſoever they were to be Adminiſtred.

'Tis true, both ſerve to repreſent Spiritual Things and Myſteries, and therefore may be juſtly enough termed Signs, Tokens, or Figures: But yet in a different Reſpect, as well as alſo in a different manner: For though Circumciſion might and did ſignify the Duty of Regeneration, or the Neceſſity thereof to Infants, when they came to Years of Underſtanding: Yet Regeneration in Actual being before their Circumciſion, could not be ſignified by it (for then they had been all ſaved) as it ought to be in the Baptized, at leaſt, in Profeſſion. *Mar.* 16. 16. *Acts* 8. 37. Which is all the Baptizer is to require, which cannot be expected of Infants: However, by the Secret Operation of God; the great Work of Regeneration may be wrought in them, from which they are not excluded by us, though they are from Baptiſm for want of an Inſtitution. And if you ſay you have as much Reaſon to look upon Infants of Believers to be Sanctified, as we have to eſteem grown Chriſtians to be ſuch; becauſe our owning of theſe as ſuch, depends upon their own Teſtimony only, in a Verbal Profeſſion, which may be Counterfeit. We Anſwer, That this is not Cogent; foraſmuch, as we have no Teſtimony of Infants that they are Regenerate; but Viſible Profeſſion of grown Perſons, being Free and Serious, is not only in the Judgment of Charity, but alſo of Miniſterial Prudence, to be taken for a Sign of Regeneration, though it may be in God's Sight Counterfeit, which belongs to us to examine.

Eighthly. But then at laſt you tell us; That though it cannot be made out, that God hath promiſed to be a God by Regenerating and Juſtifying every Believer's Child; which cannot be affirmed of all the Natural Poſterity of Believing *Abraham* himſelf, without contradicting *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. Yet, ſay you, they are *in Covenant in Reſpect of outward Priviledges.* But this we alſo deny: Nor do the Scriptures any where give any Countenance at all unto ſuch a conceit. No Scripture in the whole *New Teſtament* doth affirm it; neither by their Profeſſion; nor any other way, as a Nation; or by ſolemn Oath; or by having Prophets ſent unto them; or by any other Revelation of Gods Mind or Promiſe; are Infants ſaid to be now at all in Covenant with God, upon this Account? And if it could be made out that they have an External being in the Covenant; yet that gives them no Intereſt

tereſt in the Covenant of Grace, by God's Promiſe to be a God to *Abraham's* Seed. *Gen.* 17. 7. And therefore that Text is in vain alledged, to prove Infants to have an Intereſt in the Covenant of Evangelical Bleſſings, and ſo of right to be Sealed with the Seal thereof. For your Argument, if the terms be diſtinctly opened, is nothing elſe but this. *Infants of Believers, as their Natural Seed, are all in the Goſpel Covenant; not in the Inward, but the Outward; that is, in the Outward Adminiſtration; that is, Baptiſm; and therefore to be Baptized.* Which is meer trifling; as proving that they are to be Baptized, becauſe they are to be Baptized; and is but a meer *Petitio Principij* or a pitiful begging the Queſtion in diſpute.

It hath been frequently demanded by us, what plain Scripture can you produce for the Warrant of Infants Baptiſm? But for want of a plain Scripture Proof, you are driven to make Uſe of Conſequental Deductions. And among the reſt, you ſeem to have your Principal Reliance upon thoſe drawn from *Gen.* 17. 7. deriving your Conſequence concerning *Infants Baptiſm*, from the Covenant of Evangelical Bleſſings, which you ſay was there made with *Abraham*, and his Seed after him: And from the Intereſt, which as you ſay, the Children of Believers have, together with themſelves in that Covenant; you thence Argue, they are to be Baptized: Becauſe all that are in the Covenant, ought to have the Seal thereof. When the invalidity of this Plea is made manifeſt; you then fly to a *Covenant of outward Priviledges*, which you ſay the Children of Believers are concerned in with themſelves: But then we would willingly know, what Scripture is it that makes mention of this Covenant of outward Priviledges? *Gen.* 17. 7. makes not mention of it: For that you have often told us is to be underſtood of the Covenant of Grace; containing purely, Spiritual and Everlaſting Bleſſings; and therefore cannot be underſtood of outward Priviledges; or concerning the bare Adminiſtration or Susception of an outward Ordinance, which is the thing driven at. Where then ſhall we find this Covenant of outward Priviledges mentioned, or Recorded?

Beſides, both Circumciſion and Baptiſm alſo, according to your former Reckoning, are but Seals of the Covenant, and not the Covenant it ſelf. *All that are in Covenant* (ſay you) *muſt have the Seal thereof*; that is, *ought to be Baptized*: Whereas, after this Rate, the Seals and the Covenant it ſelf are ſtrangely confounded together. *The Children of Believers* (ſay you) *are in Covenant, equally with themſelves; not in the inward, but in the Outward part of it, in reſpect of External Priviledges, that is, Baptiſm.* But then, what becomes of the Seal, ſo much contended about? Unleſs, we muſt take it for granted, that the Seals of the Covenant, and the Covenant it ſelf, are the ſame thing, and no Diſtinction at all to be made between them. So that upon the

the whole, it clearly appears that your Arguments from the Covenant, however set forth or managed by you, are no other than a *darkning of Counsel, by Words without Knowledge.* And therefore, while you do Labour to fasten such Dismal Consequences on our Doctrine, who deny the Children of Believers to be taken into Covenant with themselves, in the sense expounded: We say they are unduly charged on us, for asmuch, as we do not exclude the Infants of Believers from the ordinary way of Salvation. For though we say not that they are in Covenant by their Parents Faith: And though we deny that they have any Right to Church Priviledges, till they are capable of making an Actual Profession of Faith and Repentance, according to the Gospel Rule; yet we say, they may be by Gods Election saved; and may be sanctified by the Spirit of God; and Parents may have ground of Comfort in their Death, as much or more than according to your Doctrine, which tells them, that their Children are in the Covenant only, in respect of outward Priviledges; the Enjoyment of which, nevertheless, can give us no undoubted Assurance of their Salvation.

Ninthly. And Lastly (as to this) whereas you tell us that Christian Baptism is come in the Room, Place, and Use of Jewish Circumcision; So as that the Institution of that should be our Rule about Baptism. To answer this doubt, let us consider the great difference between Circumcision and Baptism. Circumcision was a Legal Ordinance, appointed to the Jewish Males, Reprobate, as well as Elect, by a positive Command, to distinguish them from the rest of the World, as a Token of the Covenant, God made with *Abraham*, and signified, that the *Messiah* should come of his Loins, according to the Flesh. But Baptism is an Evangelical Ordinance, whereby Jew or Gentile, Male or Female; upon a Profession of Faith and Repentance, is Baptized in Water, in token of Regeneration; and to signifie the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, the *Messiah* already come; and so added to the Visible Church, and admitted to all the Priviledges thereof.

The Consideration of the great difference in their Institution, illustrates this also: For when Christ instituted Baptism, he says; *Go Teach, and Baptize*; and in the Administration, *they confessed and were Baptized*; not a Word of *Infants*. And in the Precept of Circumcision, not a Word of *Teaching*, or *Faith*, but of *Infants*, the command expressly notes the *Time*, *Age*, and *Sex*. And therefore, since things become Ordinances to us, by Vertue of a Word of Institution, and no such Word is to be found, to make out that Baptism succeeds Circumcision, in its Room, Place, and Use: We think it safe to be sober, and advance no further than the Scripture guides. And indeed, to make Circumcision Institutive of Baptism, is no other than to send us to School to the Law, and that *First, Old, Vanishing Covenant*, as it is stiled. *Heb.* 8. 13. as if the Lawgiver in the *New Testament* had

not

not by a positive Institution establish'd his Ordinances; nor left us any warrant for our Gospel Duties, without that Retrogression to *Moses*, and assimulating them to the Pædagoggy, and similitude of Types.

Besides, when you tell us that Christian Baptism is come in the *Room*, *Place*, and *Use* of Jewish Circumcision; so as that the Institution of that should be our Rule about Baptism. This is not right: For First, then Infant Females should not be Baptized, as hath been already noted. And to say that Females were Virtually, and Reputatively Circumcised, in the Circumcision of the Males, is frivolous: For if so, by Analogy, the Females should be only Virtually, and Reputatively, and not Actually Baptized. And if Infants out of *Abraham*'s Family were not Circumcised, though the Parent believed in God, as a Proselyte of the Gate. *e. g. Cornelius*: Then neither should an Infant of a Believer in Christ, not in a National, or other Constituted *Church*, be Baptized. And if Circumcision were of the Use of Baptism, the Circumcised Infant needed not to be Baptized. *Secondly*, it appears from *Col.* 2. 17. That a Principal Use of Circumcision, was to signifie *Christ* to come of *Abraham*; which Baptism not doing hath not a Principal Use of Circumcision. *Thirdly*. though Baptism distinguish between Believer and Unbeliever; yet it doth not make a Partition Wall between Nation and Nation, as Circumcision did; which was not to be imparted to all Believing Males of the Gentiles, as is manifest in the Case of *Cornelius*, who though fearing God, was not Circumcised, nor to be Circumcised; unless, joyned as a Member of the Jewish People. *Fourthly*, Circumcision bound Men to keep the whole Law of *Moses*, or else was Unprofitable. *Rom.* 2. 25. *Gal.* 5. 3. But Baptism Witnesseth, that the whole Ceremonial Law of *Moses*, is now made void, and only Christ's Law is to be kept. *Fifthly*, Circumcision was Administred to *Abraham's Natural Seed*, without any Profession of *Faith*, *Repentance*, or *Regeneration*; whereas, Baptism is only to be Administred to *the Spiritual Seed of* Abraham; upon an Actual Profession of *Faith*, *Repentance*, and *Regeneration*. Mark 16. 16. Acts 8. 36, 37.

It is granted, that in some things there is an Analogy betwixt them; both signifying Heart Circumcision, and an Initiating into the Church: though as the Church it self is a different Church from that under the Law; so it hath different Subjects and Church Members, and those to be Admitted upon different Grounds, and to different Ends, and in a different manner: The one to be done in a private House, and by a private Hand; the other in some publick Place, by the hand of some publick Minister, appointed by the Church to administer the same. But it follows not that because there is some Analogy betwixt Baptism and Circumcision, therefore one cometh in the room,

room, ſtead, and uſe of the other: For by the ſame reaſon we may as well conclude that Baptiſm cometh in the room and ſtead of the Ark, Manna, Rock, *&c.* And from ſuch like Arguments drawn from Analogy, what Jewiſh Rites may not be Introduced to the Juſtification of the Roman Church, in their High Prieſt-hood, and all other their innumerable Rites and Ceremonies, which without any Inſtitution of Chriſt, or New Teſtament Authority, they have Introduced upon the account of Analogy with Old Teſtament Rites and Ceremonies. And therefore if we will follow this way of Reaſoning from Infant Circumciſion to Infant Baptiſm, we muſt fall back not only to Popiſh but Jewiſh Ceremonies alſo. Nor is that Plea ſufficient to avoid it, to ſay we bring not in a new Rite in Baptizing Infants, if we uſe it not as Chriſt appointed. So they might ſay of Bell Baptiſm; and the Phariſees of their waſhing of Hands, Cups, and Veſſels of Braſs; yet condemned by Chriſt, becauſe not Commanded, but after Mens Traditions taught. Papiſts ſay they bring not in a New Rite in their Maſs; yet we charge them with a great Sin in making it a Propitiatory Sacrifice, and the Prieſt a Sacrificing Prieſt, as the Jews. The *Corinthians* did not bring in a new Rite; yet when they uſed it otherwiſe than Chriſt appointed, *it was not to Eat the Lord's Supper.* 1 Cor. 11. 20. It being the Apoſtles Rule, to uſe it *as it was received by him of the Lord.* And they that admitted Infants to the Lord's Supper, or ſhall do it, may ſay as much as you for Infants Baptiſm; that they do only apply an Inſtituted Ordinance, by way of Proportion to ſuch Subjects, though they are not Expreſly called to a Participation thereof.

Object. 12. But it is yet further Objected; That though 'tis true, when God made a Promiſe to *Abraham, to be a GOD to him, and to his Seed.* The Seed there mentioned, is applyed to Chriſt. *Gal.* 3. 16. *He ſaith not unto Seeds, as of many, but as of one; And to thy Seed, which is Chriſt.* Yet this is not to be underſtood of Chriſt *Perſonal*, but of Chriſt *Myſtical*; as in 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. And ſo is to be underſtood of the Viſible Church, of which Infants Born of Believing Parents are a part.

To this we Reply; That we muſt not be put off with bare Affirmations; but we expect Solid Proof from Scripture as to the point in hand; it being evident that the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 16. refers not to *Gen.* 17. 7. but to *Gen.* 12. 2. 3. and *Gen.* 22. 17, 18. as ſhall be afterward made manifeſt. And whereas you ſay, that the Promiſes are to be conſidered, as made to Chriſt Myſtical; that is, to the Viſible Church; the contrary appears. *Gal.* 3. 16. where the Apoſtle affirms, *that Chriſt was the Seed to whom the Promiſes were made.* And

in

in Verse 19, He saith, *the Law was added because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made.* Where it is Observable, that the Law, that is the Mosaical Administration, is said to be before the Seed was come, and was to have its Period then. Now if by the Seed Christ be not to be understood Personally, but Mystically, for the Visible or Invisible Church (take which you will) then the Law could not have been before the Seed: For God had His Church in *Abraham*'s Family 400 Years, at least, before the Law was, of which Christ was the Head, and they His Mystical Body. And so by this Interpretation the Seed should have been before the Law; contrary to the Apostle, who makes the Law to have been before the Seed, and to have its Period, when the Seed to whom the Promise was made, was come. And now the Promises running to Christ Personal, GOD makes Him over for a Covenant to the Elect, and all the Promises in Him. *Isa.* 42. 6. So that in Christ he is Our GOD; and in Christ He takes us to be his People. In Christ, and a right to the Promises; Out of Christ and *Strangers to the Covenants of Promise.* Eph. 2. 12. So that it is evident, that the Promises were first made to Christ *Personal*, and in Him to His *Mystical Body* the Church, who are united to Him by *Faith.*

Secondly. As to that Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. *For as the Body is One, and hath many Members, and all the Members of that One Body being many, are one Body: So also is Christ.* It rather seems also to be meant of the *Invisible* Church of true Believers, than of the *visible:* For the Apostle there calls none *the Body of Christ*, but such as had *received the Gifts of the Spirit.* And such as *by one Spirit*, as the concurring Cause, *had been Baptized into one Body*; yea, such who had received the Spirit *to profit withal*; such that had a real *Sympathy* one with another. Verse 26. *If one Member suffers, all the Members suffer with it. If one Member be Honoured, all the Members rejoyce with it.* All which cannot in any tollerable Sense be applyed to the *visible* Church, amongst whom there are many Hypocrites that never *received the Spirit*; nor by the Spirit could *sympathize* one with another. But however it be, most certain it is that *Infants* are not called *the Body of Christ*, if it be meant of the *visible* Church. Indeed by Virtue of the Grace of *Election*, some of them may be Members of the *Mystical* Body, the *Invisible* Church; but not at all Members of the *Visible:* Especially from this Chapter; where it is said *that if one Member suffer, all the Members suffer with it, and the Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every one to profit withal:* which cannot be applicable to Infants: For none in this Chapter are counted the *Body of Christ*, but such as are useful to the Body, as an Eye, an *Ear*, a *Hand*, a *Head*, &c. as v. 21. *The Eye cannot say to the Hand, I have no need*

of

of thee; nor the Head to the Foot, I have no need of you. From whence we draw these two Conclusions. First every Member in a Church stands in need of the help of all the other Members. Secondly, That every Member in a Church must be *useful* in his place to the rest of the Members. But of what *use are Infants* to the rest of the Members, in respect of *Edification?* So that notwithstanding this Objection, It is plain that all the Promises respecting Spiritual Blessings and the Eternal Inheritance, were first made to Christ *Personal*; and in Him they are made over to his *Mystical* Body the Church, who are united *to Him by Faith*. And in this respect therefore, it still lies upon you to prove that God hath made the *Natural Birth Priviledge*, a way under the *Gospel* Administration to be *Ingraffed into Christ Mystical*. So that upon the whole as to this, you may see to how little purpose the Promise in *Gen.* 17. 7. is alleadged to Prove the thing in Question, to wit, the Baptism of Infants now under the Gospel. That Text speaks of a Covenant made with *Abraham* and *his Seed*: It doth not say with *all Believers* and *their Seed*, or all *Church Members* and *their Seed*. Neither doth it follow by any necessary *Consequence*, that because GOD made a Covenant with *Abraham* and *his Seed*, therefore He hath made a Covenant with Believers and *their Seed*. Certain it is, the Apostle was of another Mind, who when he Expounds the Covenant of Grace, understands it to be made to *Abraham*, not as a *Natural* Father, but *as the Father of the Faithful*, both Jews and Gentiles. *Rom.* 4. 11. 12. *He received the Sign of Circumcision that he might be the Father of all them that Believe*, and walk in his Steps. So *Gal.* 3. 7. *Know ye therefore that they which are of Faith, the same are the Children of Abraham.* And those only are the Seed to whom the Gospel Covenant was made, and not to the *Natural Seed* either of *Abraham*, or any other Believers. Which hath been already made appear, and that beyond any just Contradiction.

Object. 13. But then it is yet again Objected. That in the Commission *Mat.* 28. The Apostles are there commanded *to Teach* or Disciple *all Nations, Baptizing them*; But Infants are Disciples, and therefore to be Baptized.

To this we Answer; That by that very *Commission*, *Mat.* 28. The Lord hath plainly given a Caution for the leaving out of *Infants* in this Administration, according to ordinary *Rule*: For in that he directs them to Baptize *Disciples*, upon *Preaching* he doth exclude *Infants*, who are not such *Disciples*; nor according to ordinary Providence can be. Infants after an ordinary rate, are *uncapable* of *understanding* the Gospel when Preached; and therefore are *uncapable* of being

being made Disciples thereby: And there is no other way according to an ordinary Rule, of being at all made *Disciples* but by *that means*. And this the Apostles could easily understand, as knowing that under the term *Disciple*, in common Speech, and in the whole *New Testament*, those only are meant, who being taught, Professed the Doctrine Preached by such a one: As *John's* Disciples; *Christ's* Disciples; the Disciples of the *Pharisees*; and the Disciples of the *Perverters*. *Acts* 20. 30. And accordingly they Administred Baptism. And in that Christ appoints *these* to be Baptized he Excludes *others*: For the *appointment* of *Christ* is most certainly the *Rule* according to which we are to Administer *Holy things*; and they that do otherwise follow their own Inventions, and are guilty of *Will Worship*. If you say that Infants are Disciples *Seminally*, in and by their Parents; as if Believers could beget Believers or Disciples of *Christ* by *natural* Generation; this hath been already at large disproved: The Christian Church being not made up of Persons by meer *humane* Birth, but *Spiritual Regeneration*. And to say that Infants are Born Disciples by a Relation to the *Covenant*, and so may have the *Seal* set on them, without any precedent *Teaching*, is but an unproved Dictate; as if a Title to Baptism were by a *Relation to the Covenant*, and Baptism were in its Nature a Seal of the *Covenant*, which the Scripture no where Affirms; nor is there any Rule for the Baptizing of Persons because of *Relation to the Covenant*.

But it is further Urged to this purpose; that *Infants* are called *Disciples* by the Apostle. Acts 15. 10. *Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples?* Which being spoken of *Circumcision*, must needs (say you) refer to *Infants*, as the Disciples there spoken of, as well as *others*. To this we Answer, That there is no necessity nor colour of giving to *Infants* the Name of *Disciples* from that Text: For though it is true that they are called *Disciples*, upon whose *Necks* the false Brethren would have put *the Yoke of Circumcision*; yet this proves not *Infants* to be certainly meant by *Disciples*; since *adult Believers* of the Gentiles also were required by the *Jews* to be *Circumcised*, as *Timothy*. *Acts* 13. 20. And again, though it is true that they would have had Infants, as well as the converted *Gentiles* to be Circumcised; yet the *putting the Yoke of Circumcision*, is not *Actual* Circumcision, in *their Flesh*: For that the *Jews* were *able to bear* for many Ages, and that both before, and since also to this day: But the *Yoke* of Circumcision is the *Necessity of it* on Men's *Consciences*, and therewith the *whole Law of* Moses. *ver.* 5. and that as Necessary to *Salvation*. *ver.* 1. And therefore *Peter* having said *ver.* 10. *Why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Necks of the Disciples.* Adds *ver.* 11. *But we believe, that through the Grace of the Lord Jesus, we shall be saved even as they.* Plainly implying that the *Yoke* he meant,

was

was the *neceſſity* of Circumciſion, and keeping *Moſes his Law to Salvation.* Now *this Yoke* was not put upon *Infants*, but upon *Brethren, taught the neceſſity of it.* So that upon the whole, to inſiſt upon a Command by *virtual Conſequence* from hence for the Baptizing the Infants of Believers, according to ordinary Rule, is ſo far from being *right* and *genuine*, that on the contrary this Text, *Mat.* 28. 19. clearly proves Infants are *not* by ordinary Rule to be *Baptized*; becauſe *Diſciples of all Nations*, and no other are Appointed thereunto: Whence it follows that *the Baptiſm of Infants* is beſide the *Inſtitution* and *Rule of Chriſt*; and therefore no other than *Will Worſhip* and a *Humane Invention.*

Obj. 14. But the Infants of Believers, *even while they are Infants*, are capable of being made Partakers of the *Inward Grace* of Baptiſm as well as *grown Men:* And therefore they ought to receive the *outward Sign* of Baptiſm.

Reply. The Queſtion between us is; Whether the Infants of Believers, *univerſally* or *indifferently*, are to be admitted to the Ordinance of Baptiſm, according to ordinary Rule? Now it cannot be ſuppoſed that the Infants of Believers, *indifferently* or *univerſally*, have *actually* the thing ſignified by *Baptiſm*; that is, the *Holy Ghoſt*, *Union with Chriſt*, *Adoption*, *Forgiveneſs of Sins*, *Regeneration*, and *Eternal Life:* For then they are all Sanctified, and all Believers. And if this could be proved, there would be no Queſtion about *Pædobaptiſm.* Thoſe Texts, *Acts* 8. 37. *Acts* 10. 47. *Acts* 11. 17. would undeniably prove it. And there is no *Antipædobaptiſt* but will grant, that all thoſe concerning whom there is any *tollerable Evidence* given that they are *Regenerated Perſons*, *United to Chriſt*, whoſe *Sins are forgiven*, and that have *received the Holy Ghoſt*; are to be Baptized. Now to affirm that *all* Infants of Believers, either *Actually* or *Imputatively*, are Sanctified, Regenerated, Juſtified, is quite contrary to *Rom.* 9. 6. *&c.* as alſo to daily Experience. To Baptize them *all* therefore is moſt certainly a Prepoſterous and Irregular Practice: The *outward Sign* according to your own Reckoning, of right belonging to none, but ſuch as have the *Inward Grace.* And who they are among them that have, or have not this *Inward Grace*, is not determinable, according to ordinary Rule, 'till diſcovered by an anſwerable *Profeſſion* when coming to Years of *Underſtanding.* And then indeed when ſuch a *Profeſſion* is made, we are bound according to a Judgment of *Charity* to reckon them as ſuch as are made partakers of the *Inward Grace*, whether ſo in *realty* or no. And according to this Rule only are we to proceed in our admiſſion unto Baptiſm.

Obj. 13. But doth not our Saviour tell us, *that unto such belongeth the Kingdom of Heaven?* If Children therefore are capable of the *greater*, then they are capable of the *lesser*. If capable of a Membership in the *Kingdom*, then of the *Sign* and *Cognisance* thereof: But the First is true; *Ergo*, the Latter.

To this We Answer, First, That that which you are to prove is, that *all* the Infants of Believers, or the Infants of Believers, in as much as they are the Infants of Believers, are *Actually* partakers of the *Inward Grace* of Baptism, and consequently such to whom appertains the Heavenly Kingdom. Now neither doth the Apostle's Speech, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. prove it; as hath been already shewed: Nor doth this Text, *Mat.* 19. 14. prove it. And as neither of these prove it; So *Rom.* 9, 6, 7, 8, 9. Positively disproves it. For first it is doubtful, whether those were *Infants* or no, of whom Christ here speaketh: There being several Learned Men, as *Piscator* and others, that do maintain that the Speech of Christ, *Mat.* 19. 14. is not of *Infants*; but of Children that were *capable of Instruction*: Which they gather from this *that Christ called them*. *Luke* 18. 16. And elsewhere He saith, *Whosoever shall offend one of these little Ones that Believe in Me*. *Mat.* 18. 6. *Mark* 9. 42. Which after an ordinary rate of Speech cannot be intended of *Infants*. And whereas it is said in *Mark*, *He took them up in His Arms*. The Word so Translated, is used *Mark* 9. 36. for the Imbracing of those that were of some *growth*, whom He placed in the midst, and of whose Scandalizing He there warns. Nor doth the Greek Word, used *Luke* 18. 15. Translated in English *Infants*, prove it: For the Greek Word there Translated *Infants*, as *Piscator* himself tells us, signifies a Child *capable of Teaching*. As when it is said *Timothy knew the Sacred Scriptures from a Child*: that is, ever since he was a *Boy*, not an *Infant*: It being the same Greek Word that is used in both places.

Secondly Though it should be granted that those were *Infants*; yet there is no Certainty, only Conjecture, that they were Believers *Infants*; which yet ought to be proved, if you say any thing from hence to the purpose. For though Christ was then in the Coasts of *Judea*, yet it might as well be, that the Children were brought by *others*, as Parents, and that without *Faith in Christ*, *as the Messiah*, upon the Fame of his *Miracles* and the conceit that he was a *Prophet*. And so they might bring Children to *him to be Blessed*, as *Jacob* and *Esau* by *Isaac*; and *Joseph*'s Children by *Jacob*.

Thirdly. Let it be granted they were the *Infants of Believers*, of whom our Saviour here speaketh, *that of such is the Kingdom of God*. It may be (as *Piscator* also observes) referred, not to their *present* state,

ſtate, as if for the *preſent* they were *in the Kingdom of God*, that is Believers and Juſtified; but that they were *Elect* Perſons, and ſo *in time of them ſhould be the Kingdom of God*. Now that which gives right to Baptiſm is the *preſent* Eſtate of a Perſon.

Fourthly. Though it ſhould be granted that the little Children Chriſt here ſpeaketh of, are indeed *young Sucking Infants*, that they are alſo the Infants of Believers: and that unto them alſo *belongeth the Kingdom of Heaven*; yet this is no ſufficient Ground or Warrant for us therefore to Adminiſter *Baptiſm to Infants*; It being only the *ground* laid down in the *Inſtitution* that can juſtly *warrant* the ſame. That a *Profeſſion* of Faith and Repentance is a *ſufficient ground* is undeniably to be proved from the Scriptures: But becauſe *ſome* of our Infants are, or may be in a ſtate of Salvation: or becauſe, for ought as we know, unto *all of them belongeth the Kingdom of Heaven*; that therefore they muſt all be *Baptized*, whether capable of making an Anſwerable Profeſſion or no: Neither doth the preſent *Scripture* prove it, which ſpeaks nothing at all of *Baptiſm*; nor doth any other that we can meet with, give any *Warrant*, or Countenance at all unto ſuch a *Practice*.

Obj. 16. But the *Goſpel* took place juſt as the *Old Adminiſtration* did, by bringing in *whole Families together*: When *Abraham* was taken in, his *whole Family* was taken in. So in this New Adminiſtration, uſually if the Maſter of the Houſe turned Chriſtian, *the whole Family* came in and were Baptized with him. The whole Houſhold of *Cornelius*, the firſt Converted Gentile. *Acts* 11. 14. The Houſhold of *Stephanus*. The Houſhold of *Lydia*. The Houſhold of the *Jaylor*.

Reply. Whereas you ſay the *Goſpel* took place juſt as the *Old Adminiſtration*, by bringing in *whole Families together*; By the *Old Adminiſtration* you mean *Circumciſion*; But we do not find the *Goſpel*, or *Baptiſm* took place juſt in the manner that *Circumciſion* did. For Circumciſion was but in *one Family*, ſingled out *from all the Families of the Earth*, of the *Males* only; whether in *the Covenant of Grace* or no; Children or Servants, Elder or Younger; by the Maſter of the Family, or others in his ſtead: But in *Baptiſm* it is clean otherwiſe. And as to the bringing in of *whole Families together*, it was but *contingently* ſo, not always ſo, nor *conſtantly* ſo, according to any *Promiſe* or *Prophecy*. And when it did ſo *happen*, we find not any *Infant* Baptized; nor any Intimation of Baptizing *Houſholds* in Conformity to the Adminiſtration of *Circumciſion*, but rather the contrary; Expreſs notice being given of the *Faith* and *Repentance* of thoſe Admitted unto *Baptiſm*, in the ſeveral *Houſholds* recorded to have been Baptized; (whereas *all* were to be *Circumciſed* that were of *Abrahams Family*,

both Children, Servants, Slaves, and all, whether making a *Profession of Faith and Repentance* or no.) And this may appear by taking a view of the several Examples of Baptizing, recorded in the New Testament.

Concerniug *John* the Baptist, it is said *Mat.* 3. 5. *There went out to him all* Jerusalem, *and all* Judea, *and all the Region about* Jordan, *and were Baptized of him in* Jordan, *Confessing their Sins.* In which the practice of *Baptizing* was not by taking in a *Family*, but by admitting *all* that would become *Disciples*, over all the Countries. After the Ascention of Christ, the first Example of Baptizing is that recorded *Acts* 2. 44. And there it is said, *they that gladly received the Word were Baptized.* And those were they of whom he had said, V. 39. *The Promise is to you and to your Children. And there were added unto them about* 3000 *Souls.* But no mention of any *Infants*: neither indeed is there any *probability* that any *Infants* were at all Comprehended in that Number; in as much as 'tis afterwards told us, Ver. 42. That *they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship, and in Breaking of Bread, and in Prayers.* Which cannot with any shadow of pretence be applied to *Sucking Infants.* The next Example is that of the Samaritans; of whom it is said, *Acts* 8. 12. That *when they believed, Philip Preaching the things Concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were Baptized both Men and Women.* Where *Children*, if any had been *Baptized*, might very aptly have been Inserted: But we find none mentioned to have been Baptized, but those that *Believed* and *Received the Word of God*, both *Men and Women*, not *Children*. Concerning *Cornelius* we are told *that he was a Devout Man; One that feared God with all his House.* Acts 10. 2. And Ver. 44. we are told; *While Peter yet spake these Words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word, and they spake with Tongues, and magnified God*; which cannot be affirmed of Infants. And accordingly there being convincing Evidence that they that had thus heard the Word, had received the Holy Ghost; *he commanded them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord.* Concetning the Houshold of *Stephanus*; which is said to be Baptized, 2 *Cor.* 1. 16. they are said to have *addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints.* To which most aptly may be adjoyned the House of *Crispus*; concerning whom it is said. *Acts* 18. 8. *And Crispus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue, Believed on the Lord with all his House*; *And many of the Corinthians hearing, Believed and were Baptized.* Where under the term *Houshold* those only are meant that Believed. And those that among the Corinthians were *Baptized*, are said first to *hear and Believe.* The next mentioned, is the Houshold of *Lydia*, of whom it was said that *She was Baptized and her Houshold.* Acts 16. 15. But this must be understood by other places, which when they express the Baptizing of the

Houshold,

Houſhold, they expreſs alſo the *Believing* or *Receiving of the Word by the whole Houſhold*; and by the frequent uſe of the Word, which is to put the Houſe for the People of *Growth* in it. The laſt mentioned is the Houſhold of the *Jaylor*, *Acts* 16. 33, 34. of whom it is ſaid *that he was Baptized, he and all his*; *and when he had brought them into his Houſe, he ſate Meat before them, and Rejoyced, Believing in God with all his Houſe.*

Upon the whole then it doth not appear that either one *Infant* was Baptized, or that the *Goſpel* alway took place as the *Old Adminiſtration* did, by bringing in whole *Families* together; yea the contrary appears, out of the 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. As alſo from 1 *Cor.* 7. 13, 16. That the *Husband* was Converted ſometimes without the *Wife*; and the *Wife* ſometimes without the Husband. So ſometimes in the Houſe of *Infidel Maſters*, were *Converted Servants.* 1 *Tim.* 6. 1, 2. And on the contrary, *Phil.* 11, 12, *&c.* And our Lord Jeſus fore-told it ſhould be ſo in the Preaching of the Goſpel. *Mat.* 10. 35. 36. To affirm therefore that there were *Infants* in any of thoſe forementioned *Houſholds*, or if there were that they were *Baptized*, is more than doth well become us to aſſert, ſince the Scripture makes no mention of them in either reſpect: And conſequently much to blame are they that build their Practice upon ſo infirm a Bottom.

Obj. 17. But then it is again *Objected*; That as there is no Expreſs Command or Example in the Scripture concerning the Baptiſm of Infants; ſo neither is there any concerning the Baptiſm of Perſons at Age, whoſe Parents were Chriſtians, and who have been Educated from their Child-hood in the Chriſtian Religion; the Scripture giving no account of the Baptiſm of any in the Apoſtles Days, but ſuch as were Converted from Judaiſm or Paganiſm to Chriſtianity. And if a juſt Conſequence may be admitted for the proof of the one, Why not for the other alſo? You are wont to reject all Scripture Conſequences in reſpect of Infants Baptiſm; and yet here you muſt of neceſſity admit of the ſame: So that this Argument therefore returns upon your ſelves.

To this we Reply; Firſt that though it ſhould be granted that there is no expreſs Example in the Scripture of the Baptiſm of Perſons at Age, whoſe Parents were Chriſtians, yet the Precept concerning Baptiſm is as expreſs for ſuch, as for any others. *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c. Mark* 16. 15, 16. *Go Preach the Goſpel to every Creature. He that Believeth and is Baptized ſhall be Saved.* Where none are excluded that are capable of being Taught or Diſciples into the true Faith or Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, let their Parentage be what it will.

Secondly, It is ſufficient unto us, that as the Commiſſion is expreſs, ſo there are Examples enough in the Scripture concerning the Bap-

tism of *Believers*. So that let a Person be but a *Believer*, and we have no Reason to look into his *Pedigree*; nor have we any Rule that so directs us, in order to his Admission to Baptism. And as we have no Rule nor Reason to accept of a Person that believes, the rather because he had Christian Parents; so neither to reject him upon that ground. Could the like Command or Examples be produced from the Scripture concerning *Infants Baptism*, as can easily be produced concerning the *Baptism of Believers* (for under that Notion only are we bound to take Cognisance of those Baptized by us) the present Controversie would suddenly be concluded betwixt us. And therefore;

Thirdly. This cuts not off our Pretensions, to something more than a bare consequential Deduction for the Justification of our Practice; whilst Consequences only, and those far fetch'd, and streined enough, are the best bottom that Infants Baptism is built upon; Which Consequences of yours, are a most insufficient ground for the Justification thereof: For though it is true, that in respect of all sorts of moral Duties, or other concernments of Christianity, Consequences are allowable enough, and we are sufficiently warranted in our Practice therein, and that not only from the Practice of our Saviour himself, who took this Method for the Proof of the Resurrection; but from several other such like Instances in the Scripture. And indeed without them, neither can the Word be Preached, nor the Duties of Christianity inforced, as they ought upon the Conscience; yet this is an infallible Maxim, a Rule beyond all just Contradiction, and which hath accordingly been urged by multitudes of Protestant Divines, by way of Opposition to the Papal Usurpation; *That in respect of all Positive or Instituted Worship, such as Baptism is, that hath no other Rule nor Reason, than the meer Will of the Law-giver; there must be something in the Scripture, either by way of Precept or Example, that alone can justly warrant our Practice therein.* The Reason is obvious, because Baptism (being a part of Instituted Worship, not found in Natures Garden) hath of it self no vertue, but what it receives from the *Institutor*: It being a right Note, That *Moral Laws are good, and therefore commanded: But Positive Worship is commanded, and therefore good.* And accordingly, though Moral Duties are easily deducible from their proper Premises; yet we cannot possibly arrive unto any certain Knowledge of our Duty in reference to Positive Worship, without some expres signification of God's mind unto us therein. True it is, that in some Cases, if an expres Precept be wanting, we may justly enough recurr to the Example of the Apostles, as a sufficient Authority for our Practice. As for Instance, in the Case of the Observation of the Lord's day; concerning which though we have no expres Precept to warrant our Practice therein,

we

we are yet justifiable enough upon that Account, in that we have the frequent Examples of the Apostles, recorded in the Scripture to that purpose; whose steps we are bid to follow. But when Precept and President do both fail us, as is most evidently the case with us in respect of Infants Baptism, and which hath been accordingly ingeniously owned, by some of the chiefest of the Pædobaptists themselves: We do certainly step aside into a wrong Path, in our Practices of that kind. And justly enough therefore, may our common Adversaries the Papists, twit us in the Teeth with the Guilt of a Self-condemned Practice, while we blame that in them, which yet we our selves do allow in other Cases. And how can we call upon them, to produce something or other by way of Precept or President from the Scripture, for the justification of their Ceremonies, without the one or the other of which, we justly condemn them as unlawful, when we our selves are found highly guilty of the same Transgression, and that in a greater degree in other Respects.

Object. 18. But it is yet further Objected; That Infants by God's express Command, were to be Circumcised under the former Administration; and all God's Commands about His Institutions then, (according to the Rules of Analogy or Proportion) are equally binding unto us, as well as to the *Jews*. As in the case of the Christian Sabbath, unto which the Fourth Commandment binds us, as it did the *Jews* to the former. And thus it is in reference to Infants Baptism; in respect of which, though there is no express Command to that purpose, recorded in the New Testament; yet we cannot but conclude, that God's Command unto the *Jews* to Circumcise their Infants, carries with it the force, at least, of a virtual Command unto us to Baptize ours.

To this we reply; That certain it is, that that which concerns the Worship of God, which hath not an express Institution in the New Testament, is now to be rejected by us; which is to be understood, as we have said before, in respect of Positive Worship, consisting in outward Rites; such as Circumcision, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper are, which have nothing Natural or Moral in them; but are meerly Ceremonial. For as for that which is Natural, or Moral in God's Worship, we allow that an Institution or Command in the Old Testament, is Obligatory to Christians under the New. And such do we conceive the Sabbath to be, as being of the Law of Nature: For outward Worship being due to God, Days are due to God to that end; and therefore even in Paradise appointed from the Creation; and in all Nations, in all Ages observed, enough to prove so much to be of the Law of Nature. And therefore the Fourth

Commandment is justly put among the Morals; which proves, that at least a seventh Portion of time is to be dedicated more immediately to the Service of God. Now Circumcision hath nothing Moral in it; it is meerly Positive. Neither was it so from the beginning, nor observed by all Nations, in all Ages; nor is it in the Decalogue. And therefore the Observation of the Lord's Day may stand, though Circumcision fall, and though there be no other Ordinance come in the room of it, that bears Analogy or Proportion with it.

Secondly, When we require express Institution in the New Testament, in respect of the Matters of God's Worship now to be practised by us; We do not mean, that in all Positive Worship, there must always be of necessity a positive Command in so many Words, in form of a Precept: But we conceive, that the Example of the Apostles, which hath not a meer temporary Reason, is enough to prove that Institution from God, to which that Practice doth relate. And in this therefore as we said before, in Answer to the foregoing Objection; we reckon it a sufficient Warrant for the Justification of our Practise, in the Observation of the Lord's Day, that such was the Practise of the Apostles, according to those plain Testimonies thereof, recorded in the Holy Scripture, though it be not expresly commanded. Now if the one half of this Evidence could be brought for the Baptism of Infants, we should make no question, but readily subscribe unto it, But Infants Baptism not consisting with the Order of Christ in the Institution; being contrary to the Practice of *John* the *Baptist*, and the Apostles; there being no Foot-steps of it at all in the Scripture; nor till about 200 years after Christ's Incarnation; we dare not assent unto the Practise of it, upon a supposed Analogy, or Proportion between that and Circumcision.

And evident it is, that it is a most dangerous Principle upon which they go, that so argue; to wit, that in meer positive things, such as Circumcision and Baptism are, we may frame an Addition to God's Worship from Analogy, or Resemblance conceived by us, between two Ordinances, whereof one is quite taken away, without any Institution, gathered by Precept, or Apostolical Example: For if we may do it in one thing, why not in another? Where shall we stop? Certain it is, that this very Principle hath brought in all the Popish Ceremonies into the *Romish* Church. That which Christ and his Apostles have taken from the *Jews*, and appointed unto us, we are to receive as they have appointed. But if any others shall take upon them to appoint to Mens Consciences, any Rite, in whole or in part, on their own conceived Reason, from Analogy with the *Jewish* Ceremonies; It is an high Presumption in such, against Christ, and against the Apostles Command to yield to it. *Col.* 2. 20. Though

it

it hath *a ſhew of Wiſdom.* *verſe* 23. And the Apoſtles Example binds us to oppoſe it, *Gal.* 2. 3, 4, 5.

Object. 19. But if the Baptiſm of Believers, be the only Baptiſm which Chriſt hath appointed: How comes it to paſs, that ſo many learned and pious Men, ſhould for ſo long a Seaſon, and throughout ſo many Generations cleave to Infants Baptiſm, whilſt ſo few, in Compariſon do embrace the contrary Practiſe?

For Anſwer hereunto: *Firſt*, It is to be duly noted, that as the Scripture hath clearly foretold us of a Defection, or an Apoſtacy from the Primitive Purity and Simplicity of the Goſpel, in reſpect both of Doctrine and Diſcipline, which was to happen, when the Man of Sin was to be Revealed, and the Myſtery of Iniquity was to be diſcovered in the World; even that Lawleſs one, *who ſhould ſit in the Temple of God, as God; Oppoſing and Exalting himſelf above all that is called God, or that is Worſhipped*: And as *Paul* doth alſo forewarn the Elders of the Church at *Epheſus*, not only, that *grievous Wolves ſhould enter in among them after his Departure, not ſparing the Flock*. But alſo, that *of their own ſelves ſhould Men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things, to draw away Diſciples after them*: Which ſhould leſſen our Wonder in this Reſpect. So it is no leſs obſervable, that as the Apoſtacy came in gradually, the Myſtery of Iniquity prevailing ſtep by ſtep; ſo doth the Wiſdom of the Lord ſeem to order the Recovery thereof. And therefore ſo it is, that in theſe laſt Ages, when the Reformation firſt began to be ſet on foot in the World, the *Doctrinal* part of the Goſpel was firſt notably cleared up, whilſt yet there remained a very great Corruption in point of *Diſcipline*, or in reſpect of the Primitive Purity of *Goſpel-Worſhip*: As in the Caſe of *Luther*, and many others of the firſt Reformers, who notwithſtanding their zealous Pleading for the Doctrine of free Juſtification, by the Blood of Chriſt, in Oppoſition to Popiſh Merits, *&c.* yet held faſt Images in Churches, Conſubſtantiation, Bowing to the high Altar, the Surplice in Preaching, the Croſs in Baptiſm; and many other things which the After Reformers could not but ſee them, to be clearly defective in. So that the light of God's People comes not up to its proper *Acme* all at once, but by degrees. And ſuitably hath the Reformation advanced, and the Truths and Ordinances of Chriſt been cleared up, and recovered from the Encroachments, and Corruptions of the *Man of Sin*: One Age recovering one part; and another, another; making good that Word, *Prov.* 4. 18. *The Path of the juſt is as the ſhining Light, that ſhineth more and more unto the perfect Day*; which holds good in reference to the general Diſpenſations of God's Providence toward his People, as well as in particular Caſes.

Secondly,

Secondly; We must follow no Man's Example therefore, no not the Apostles themselves, further than it can be made out unto us, that they were followers of Christ. 1 *Cor.* 11. 1. And certain it is, that the Examples of the best Men living will be no sufficient Justification to us in the matters of Divine Worship, when contradicting an express Word. *Jehoshaphat* and *Asa*, were both good King's of *Israel*, and great Reformers; yet in many things they did prevaricate, and transgressed the Commandments of the Lord; and particularly in their not removing the *High Places*; and for which they are both taxed by the Holy Spirit, 1 *Kings* 15. 14. and *Chap.* 22. 43. And indeed, as the High Places then ought to have been removed; so the same ought to have been done by our first Reformers, in respect of Infants Baptism, and other Ceremonies of the *Romish* Church: Which other Ceremonies they retained in hope, 'tis true, of gaining over the *Papists*, to a Compliance with the then Established Discipline; though it succeeded far otherwise than was expected: For the retaining of those Ceremonies, did but so much the more harden the Papal Party in their other Devices. We must follow no mans Example therefore, against the Word of God, upon an undue Presumption, that any of the Sons of Men, how Pious or Learned soever, are infallible, either in point of Doctrine or Practise. *Humanum est errare*, must not be forgotten.

Thirdly. To lay the stress of your Argument, upon the Unlikelyhood, that so great a Number of God's People, in so many Ages, should be left in the dark, in Reference to such a Gospel Ordinance as Baptism is; As it proceeds from the want of a due Consideration of that Apostacy of the Church from its Primitive Purity, in respect both of Doctrine and Worship, which the Scripture do so clearly foretel us concerning: So the Language of it sounds no other than this; That we cannot miss of doing right and well, if we follow the Pious Examples of those that are gone before us; not considering that as they were Men, and Men of like Infirmities with our selves: So that it no way follows, that because there is a beginning Reformation, in respect of the forementioned Apostacy, we must go no further. True it is, that we are to give no Entertainment unto any New Light or Doctrine in these Respects, that hath not been already declared unto us in the Holy Scriptures: But if upon a due search it can be made appear unto us from the Word of God, that we have hitherto gone astray in a point of such Importance to the Worship and Service of God, as Baptism is: As we ought not to shut our Eyes against the Light so shining upon us; so it will not excuse our Continuance in such a Path of Errour, that we have the Company of so many Wise, Learned, and Holy Men, that are therein Fellow Transgressours with us.

Fourthly.

Fourthly. We have not been without the Testimony of many Learned, Pious, and Holy Men, who have born Witness unto the Truth we are now pleading for, and that in many former Ages, as well as in this. For it is well known that Infants Baptism was very early opposed, if not so soon as it was born; for no Antiquity mentions it to have had any peaceable being in the World any long time before it was opposed: And if it be said that it was not opposed at the beginning, assoon as it came into the World; it may be so: For Christ saith, *Whilst the Servants slept the Evil One Sowed Tares.* And surely it was a sleepy Time amongst Christians when it came in; but when they began to awake they opposed it. Besides which,

Fifthly. We have the Witness of some of your own Party, whose Tongues and Pens God hath (at least) so over-ruled, that they have born a Famous Testimony for our Practise.

First. Dr. *Taylor* saith; 'This indeed is true Baptism, when it is 'both in the *Symbol* and the *Mystery*. Whatsoever is less than this, is 'but the *Symbole* only, and a meer *Ceremony*; an *Opus Operatum*; a dead 'Letter; an empty Shadow; an *Instrument* without an *Agent* to manage it. *Lib. of Proph.* p. 242.

Secondly. 'Baptism is never propounded, mentioned, or enjoyned, 'as a means of Remission of Sins, or of Eternal Life; but something 'of *Duty*, *Choice*, and *Sanctity*, is joined with it, in order to the Production of the end so mentioned. *p.* 243.

Thirdly. 'They that Baptize Children, make Baptism to be wholly 'an *Outward Duty*; a Work of the *Law*; a *Carnal* Ordinance: It makes 'us adhere to the *Letter*, without regard to the *Spirit*; and to Relinquish the *Mysteriousness*, the *Substance*, the *Spirituality* of the Gospel. 'Which Argument is of so much the more Consideration; because 'under the *Spiritual Covenant* of the Gospel of Grace; if the *Mystery* 'goes not *before* the *Symbole*, (which it doth when the *Symboles* are 'Cognations of Grace, as the *Sacraments* are;) yet it always *accompanies* it; but never *follows* in Order of Time, and is clear in the 'perpetual *Analogy* of Holy Scripture.

Fourthly, 'That the words mentioned in St. *Peter's* Sermon, *Act.* 2. '(which are the only Records of the Promises) are interpreted upon 'a weak mistake. *The Promise belongs to you and your Children:* Therefore *Infants* are actually Receptive of it in that *Capacity*. That is the 'Argument: But the Reason of it is not yet discovered; nor ever 'will: For (*to you and your Children*) is to you and your *Posterity*; 'to you and *your Children*, when they are of the *same Capacity*, in 'which you *are*, receptive of the Promise. But he that whenever 'the Word *Children* is Expresst, understands *Infants*, must needs believe that in all *Israel* there were *no Men*; but all were *Infants:* And

'if

'if that had been true, it had been the greater wonder that they 'should overcome the *Anakims*, and beat the King of *Moab*, and 'March so far, and Discourse so well, for they were all called *the* 'Children of Israel. *p.* 233.

Fifthly, Whereas 'tis Argued from the Commission. *Mark* 16. 6. *He that Believeth and is Baptized shall be Saved.* Infants are Believers, and therefore according to the Commission they are to be Baptized. 'Whether Infants (*saith he*) have Faith or no, is a Question to be 'disputed by Persons that Care not *how much* they *say*, and *how little* 'they *prove*. First, *Personal* and *Actual* Faith they have none. For 'they have no Acts of Understanding: And besides, how can any 'Man know that they have, since he never saw any sign of it, neither 'was he told so by any that could tell? *Secondly*, Some say they have '*Imputative*; but then so let the *Sacrament* be to; that is, if they 'have the *Parents Faith*, or the *Churches*, then so let *Baptism* be im-'puted also by Derivation from them; And as in their Mothers Womb, 'and while they hung on their Mothers Breasts, they live upon their 'Mothers Nourishment: So they may upon the *Baptism* of their Pa-'rents, or their Mother the Church: For since Faith is necessary to 'Baptism (and they themselves confess it by striving to find out new 'Kinds of Faith to dawb the matter up,) such as the *Faith*, such 'must be the *Sacrament*; for there is no Proportion, between an *Ac-'tual* Sacrament, and an *Imputative* Faith; *this* being an immediate 'and necessary Order to *that*. And whatsoever can be said to take off 'from the necessity of *Actual* Faith; all that and much more may be 'said to excuse from the *Actual* Susception of Baptism. The *first of* 'these Devices, was that of *Luther*, and his Scholars; *the second* of *Cal-'vin*, and his. And yet there is a *Third Device*, which the Church 'of *Rome* Teaches, and that is, that Infants have *Habitual Faith*, but 'who told them so? How can they prove it? What Revelation or 'Reason teacheth any such thing? Are they by this Habit so much as 'disposed to an Actual Belief, without a Miracle? Can an Infant, sent 'into a *Mahometan* Province be more confident for Christianity, when 'he comes to be a Man, than if he had not been Baptized? Are there 'any Acts precedent, concomitant, or consequent to this pretended 'Habit? This strange Invention is absolutely without Art, without 'Scripture, Reason, or Authority; but the Men are to be excused 'unless there were a better. *p.* 240.

'To which, (*saith he,*) This Consideration may be added; that 'if *Baptism* be neeessary to the Salvation of Infants (*as the Fathers of 'old*, and the Church of *Rome* and *England since*) upon whom is the 'Imposition laid? To whom is the Command given? To the Parents 'or the Children? Not to the Parents, for then God hath put the 'Salvation of Innocent Babes into the Power of *others*, and Infants

'may

'may be damned for their Fathers Careleſsneſs, or Malice. It fol-
'lows that it is not neceſſary at all to be done to them, to whom it
'cannot be preſcribed as *a Law*, and in whoſe behalf it cannot be
'reaſonably entruſted to *others* with the Apendant Neceſſity: And if
'it be not *neceſſary*, it is certain it is not *Reaſonable*; and moſt certain
'it is no where in *terms preſcribed*; and therefore it is preſumed that
'*Baptiſm* ought to be underſtood and adminiſtred, according as other
'Precepts are, with Reference to the *Capacity* of the Subject, and the
'*Reaſonableneſs* of the thing.

And again, *p.* 242. 'If any Man runs for Succour to that exploded
'*Creſphugeton*, that Infants have Faith, or any other inſpired Habit, of
'I know not what or how; we deſire no more Advantage in the
'World, than that they are conſtrained to anſwer without Revelation
'againſt Reaſon, common Senſe, and all the Experience in the
World.

'*Sixthly.* But Tradition (*ſaith he*) by all means muſt ſupply the
'place of Scripture; and there is pretended a *Tradition* Apoſtolical,
'that Infants were Baptized. But at this (*ſaith he*) we are not much
'moved; for we who rely upon the written Word of God, as ſuffi-
'cient to eſtabliſh all true Religion, do not value the Allegation of
'Tradition. And however the World goes, none of the *Reformed*
'Churches can pretend this Argument for this Opinion: Becauſe they
'who reject *Tradition*, when it is againſt them, muſt not pretend it in
'the leaſt for them. But if we will allow the *Topick* to be good; yet
'how will it be verified? For ſo far as can yet appear, it relies wholly
'upon the Teſtimony of *Origen*; for from him *Auſtin* had it. Now a
'*Tradition* Apoſtolical, if it be not conſigned with a fuller Teſtimony
'than of one Perſon, whom all other Ages have condemned of other
'*Errors*; and whoſe Works, ſaith *Eraſmus*, are ſo ſpurious, that he
'that reads them, is uncertain, whether he read *Origen*, or *Ruffinus*;
'therefore will obtain ſo little Reputation amongſt thoſe, who know
'that things have upon greater Authority, been pretended to be re-
'ceived from the Apoſtles, but falſly; that it will be a great Argu-
'ment, that he is Ridiculous, and Weak, that ſhall be determined
'by ſo weak *Probation* in matters of ſo great Concernment. But beſides
'that, the *Tradition* cannot be proved to be *Apoſtolical*; we have very
'good Evidence from *Antiquity*, that it was the Opinion of the Pri-
'mitive Church, that Infants ought not to be Baptized; which (*ſaith*
'*he*) is clear in the Canon of *Neocæſarea*; which he mentions at
'large in the Original Greek; determining that none ought to be
'Baptized, without giving an Account of their Faith, and deſiring
'the ſame.

'And

'And therefore whoever will pertinaciously perſiſt in this Opinion 'of the Pædobaptiſts, and Practiſe it accordingly, they polute the 'Blood of the Everlaſting Covenant: They Diſhonour and make a Pa'geantry of the Sacrament: they ineffectually repreſent a Sepulture 'into the Death of Chriſt, and pleaſe themſelves in a Sign without 'effect, making Baptiſm like the Fig-Tree in the Goſpel, full of 'Leaves, but no Fruit; and they invocate the Holy Ghoſt in vain, do'ing as if one ſhould call upon him to illuminate a Stone or a Tree 'Thus far Dr. *Taylor*. p. 244.

Mr. *Baxter* ſaith, *If there can be no Example given in the Scripture of any one that was Baptized, without the Profeſſion of a Saving Faith. nor any Precept for ſo doing; then muſt we not Baptize any without it: But the Antecedent is true; therefore ſo is the conſequent.* 2. Diſp *againſt Mr* Blake. 16. Arg. p. 149.

2dly. *Chriſt hath inſtituted no Baptiſm, but what is to be a ſign of preſent Regeneration: But to Men that underſtand not a Juſtifying Faith it cannot be Adminiſtred as a ſign of preſent Regeneration; therefore he hath Inſtituted no Baptiſm to be Adminiſtred to ſuch.* 10th. Arg. p 117, 118.

3dly. *If it be the appointed Uſe of all Chriſtian Baptiſm to ſolemnize our Marriage with Chriſt, or to Seal and Confirm our Union with him: Then muſt we Baptize none that profeſs not juſtifying Faith: But the Antecedent and Conſequent are evident.* Gal. 3. 27, 28, 29. p. 98.

The Lord *Brookes* ſaith; *That the Analogy which Baptiſm now hath with Circumciſion in the Old Law, is a fine Rationall Argument to Illuſtrate a Point well proved before: But I ſomewhat doubt whether it be Proof enough for that which Some would prove by it; Since (beſides the vaſt difference in the Ordinance) the perſons to be Circumciſed are ſtated by a Poſitive Law ſo Expreſs, that it leaves no place for Scruple: But it is far otherwiſe In Baptiſm; Where all the Deſignation of Perſons fit to be Partakers, for ought I know are ſuch as Believe: For this is the Qualification, which with Exacteſt Search, I find the Scripture Requires in perſons to be baptized. And this it ſeems to require in all ſuch Perſons. Now how Infants can be properly ſaid to Believe, I am not yet fully reſolved.*

Dr. *Barlow* Biſhop of *Lincoln*, hath theſe Words, in a Letter of his in Print. *I do believe and know* (ſaith he) *that there is neither Precept, nor Example in Scripture for* Pædobaptiſm; *nor any juſt Evidence of it for above 200 Years after Chriſt. That* Tertullian *condemns it as an Unwarrantable Cuſtom. And* Nazianzen *a good while after him diſlikes it too. Sure I am, that in the Primitive Times they were* Catecheumeni; *then* Illuminati, *or* Baptizati; *And that not only* Pagans, *and* Children *of* Pagans, *converted; but Children of* Chriſtian Parents. *The Truth is, I do believe,* Pædobaptiſm (*how, or by whom, I know not*) *came into the World in the ſecond Century. And in the Third and Fourth began to be practiſed, though not generally, and defended as Lawful, from that*

that Text grosly Misunderstood. Jo. 1. 3. *Upon the like gross Mistake of* Jo. 6. 53. *They did for many Centuries, both in the Greek and Latine Church, communicate Infants, and give them the Lord's Supper. And I do confess they might do both as well as either. But although they Baptiz'd some Infants, and thought it Lawful so to do; yet* Austin *was the First that ever said it was Necessary.*

I have read what my Learned and worthy Friends Dr. Hammond, *Mr.* Baxter, *and others say in Defence of it; And I confess, I wonder not a little, that Men of such great Parts should say so much to so little purpose: For I have not as yet seen any thing like an Argument for it.* Thus far Dr. *Barlow.*

Obj. 20. But the Apostle tells us; *That neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but a New Creature:* It is our *main* Business therefore to press after the Power of Godliness: And we are afraid that while there is so much stress laid upon the *Circumstantials* of Religion, it tends to the losing the Substance. Besides having been already Baptized in our Infancy, what necessity is there for the Repetition thereof? It being an approved Maxim, that that which ought not to be done, being done, ought not to be undone.

We Answer, *First*, whereas you tell us, that neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Un-circumcision, but a new Creature. Certain it is, that *once* Circumcision was something, when the Lord would have killed *Moses* because of the Circumcision. *Exod* 4. 24, 26. And when the Lord said, *That whosoever was not Circumcised should be cut off from his People. Gen.* 17. 14. True it is, that now under the Gospel it is nothing, because Abolished. *Gal.* 5. 2. *If you be Circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing:* But shall we therefore say that *Baptism* is nothing? Baptism is *the Counsel of God.* Luk. 7. 29. And is that nothing? Baptism is a *Command* of the Lord Jesus. *Mat.* 28. 19. And is his Command nothing? And therefore;

Secondly; We cannot be justly affirmed to have placed more stress on the Ordinance insisted on, than the Scripture it self chargeth on it. In which respect it ought to be considered, what our Saviour himself speaks, when he was to be Baptized by *John*, after the manner we are now pleading for. *Mat.* 3. 15. *Suffer it to be so now: For thus it becometh to fulfil all Righteousness.* And what is that Righteousness or Holiness which God now requireth of us; but our answerable Conformity to the revealed Will of God; and that both in respect of the Duties of the *first*, as well as the *Second* Table? Upon which account we ought further to consider, what a special charge our Lord Jesus left with his Apostles upon his Departure hence; That they should teach the Nations *to observe all things, whatsoever he had commanded*

manded them. And this of Believers Baptism amongst the rest. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 16. And elsewhere *Paul* commends the *Corinthians*, for that they had kept the Ordinances *as they were delivered unto them*, 1 Cor. 11. 2. It is therefore certainly an undue Reflection, when you suppose, that we place too much stress upon an Ordinance of Christ; while we plead for the *Purity* of its Practise, according to the *Primitive* Institution. It was our Saviours passionate Expression to his Disciples. *John* 14. 15. *If ye love me, keep my Commandments.* And *John* 15. 14. *Ye are my Friends, if ye do whatsoever I Command you.* We cannot therefore express our Friendship to Christ as we ought, if we are negligent on this *Account.* And certain it is, that as we cannot express our Love to Christ aright, if we do not *whatsoever* he hath commanded us: So if we do it not as he hath commanded us; for if God were so strict as we all know he was upon this Account, under the former Administration; we cannot rationally expect to be Indulged in a known Deviation in respect of any part of that Worship which he hath *now* Prescribed unto us. Holiness and Righteousness, respecting our Duty both to God and Man, is indeed indispensibly required of us; and it cannot be denied, but that the Baptism of Believers we are now pleading for, is a *main* part thereof; it being that *Homage* or *Worship* which we do more immediately perform, and offer up unto the great God: So that we place no more stress thereon, than the matter requires; we dare not indeed lay that stress upon it; as some of our Adversaries in this point have done, who have made it *absolutely necessary to Salvation*: From a gross Misunderstanding of that Text. *John* 3. 5. *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*; but though an *Ignorant*, or *Unwilling* neglect thereof, will not unavoidably shut us out from God's presence; yet since Christ hath commanded it, and hath promised his presence to his People in the due performance of it, it cannot be denied, but that we are infinitely obliged to be found in an answerable Practise. And therefore;

Thirdly; Whereas you tell us, that having been already Baptized in your *Infancy*, you reckon there is no necessity lying on you, to be again Baptized; We Answer, that it is no way safe for any to rest Contented with that *Pretended* Baptism they received in their *Infancie*, It being a meer *Nullity* in respect of the New Testament Ordinance of Baptism. And the Reason is plain, because there was that wanting in it, which is Absolutely *Essential* thereunto. For when you Baptize *Infants*, or were your selves baptized in that *Capacity*, by sprinkling a little Water only on the Face, there was a manifest failure, First in

in respect of the *right Subject*; and Secondly in respect of the *right form* or *manner* of the Administration of that Ordinance.

First, In respect of the right *Subject*, which must be qualified according to the *Institution*; that is, the Person to be Baptized, ought to be a *Believer*; or at least one that makes an *External Profession* of Faith in Christ, as hath been already proved from *Mark* 16. 16. *Acts* 8. 37. *&c.* Now unless you can demonstrate that at the time when Baptism was Administred to you in your *Infant state*, you were then *Actual Believers*; or at least that you did then make some sensible *Profession* thereof, you were not according to Christ's Rule, the right or proper Subjects of such an Ordinance.

Secondly; In respect of the *External Mode*, or *Form of its Administration*; which if we consult the Scripture Rule, is not to be performed by *sprinkling* or pouring a little Water upon the *Face only*; but by *dipping the whole Person under Water, and raising him up again*, to Figure out unto us, our Communion with Christ, in His Death, Burial, and Resurrection. And that the Manner and Ceremony of Baptism ought to be by *dipping* or *plunging the whole Body under Water*; and not by *sprinkling* or *pouring* a little Water only on the *Face* or *Head* (as hath been commonly *used*, since the *Subjects* have been changed from *Men* to *Babes*;) is thus made good.

1. First from the *proper* and genuine Signification of the *Word*, so well agreeing with the *ends* and *use* of *Baptism*, the *Ceremony* with the *Substance*, and the *Sign* with the *thing signified*. The Word we call *Baptism*, and the Latins *Baptismus*, is no other than the Greek Word Βαπτισμα, and in plain *English*, is to *dip*, *plunge*, or *cover all over*. Which we find witnessed unto by the following Authors; Men of Learning and Piety, though differing from us in our present Practise.

Stephens and *Scapula*, two as great Masters of the *Greek* Tongue, as we have any (and both Defenders of Infants Baptism) do tell us in their *Lexicons*, *That* Βαπτιζω *from* Βαπτω, *signifies* Mergo, Immergo, obruo; item tingo, quod fit immergendo, inficere, imbuere. *viz. To dip, plunge, overwhelm, put under, cover over, to Die in Colour, which is done by Plunging.* They tell us also it signifies *ablue, lavo.*

Leigh in his *Critica Sacra*, saith, *Its native and proper Signification, is to dip into Water; or to plunge under Water.*

Salmatius, in his Book *de Prim. Papæ.* p. 193. saith, *That is not* Baptism *they give to Children, but* Rantism.

Mr. *Dan. Rogers*, in his Treatise of *Sacraments*, Part 1. C. 5. P. 70. Saith, *the* Greeks *wanted not other Words to express any other Act besides Dipping, if the Institution could bear it, What Resemblance of the Burial, or Resurrection of Christ is in Sprinkling? All Antiquity and Scripture*, saith he, *confirm that way. To Dip therefore is exceeding Material to the*

Ordinance; which was the usuage of Old, without Exception of Countries, hot or cold.

Dr. *Taylor* in his Rule of Conf. L. 3. C. 4. *If you would attend to the proper signification of the Word; Baptism signifies Plunging in Water, or Dipping, with Washing.*

Mr. *Joseph Mede*, in his Diatribe on *Tit.* 3. 2. *Saith that there was no such thing as Sprinkling, or Rantism, used in Baptism in the Apostles Days, nor in many Ages after them.*

Chamier, Pan. Cathol. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 2. Serm. 6. *The Antient Use of Baptism was to dip the whole Body into the Element, which is the Force of* Τὸ Βαπτιζειν: *Therefore did* John *Baptize in a River; which is nevertheless changed into Aspersion, though uncertain when and from whence that Custom was taken.*

Dr. *Martin Luther*, in his Book de Baptismo, Tom. 1. p. 71. 72. Speaking of the signification of the Word. *Baptismus Græcum est, Latine potest verti mersio, cum Immergimus aliquid in Aqua ut totum tegatur Aqua, & quamvis ille mos aboleverit, apud plerosq; debeant tamen prorsus immergi, & statim retrahi & sane si Spectes quid Baptismus significet, idem requiri videbis.* That is, Baptism is a Greek Word, and may be Interpreted an Over-whelming, when we plunge any thing into the Water, that it may be covered all over. And although that Custom is now out of use with many, yet they ought truly to be dipt, and presently lifted up again. And certainly if you consider the nature of the thing, you will see that to be necessary.

Secondly, It is very considerable how Emphatically this Sense and Signification of the Word is confirmed unto us, by the several Metaphors used by the Holy Spirit in Scripture, in allusion hereto. *viz.* when *Persons* are Implunged into great Afflictions, they are said to be *Baptized* therein. *Mark* 10. 38. And so for Persons that were endowed with great measures of the Spirit, they are said to *be Baptized* therewith. *Acts* 1. 5. The Children of *Israel* being encompassed with the Cloud over their Head, and the divided Sea on both sides, were said to *be Baptized* in the Cloud, and in the Sea. 1 *Cor.* 10. And Baptized Persons are said to be Dead and Buried, in allusion to putting Men into the Earth, and covering them therewith. None of which can be figured by the sprinkling of a little Water upon the Face.

Thirdly. It appears to be so from the Practice and Usage we find hereof in Scripture; and the Opinion of the Learned upon it.

First in the Story of *Christ's Baptism*, we read *Mat.* 3. 5. *That Jesus came from* Galilee *to* Jordan *unto* John *to be Baptized of him.* And ver. 16. *When he was Baptized, he went up straitway out of the Water.* The Learned *Cajetan* upon the place saith; *Christ ascended out of the Water; therefore Christ was Baptized by* John, *not by sprinkling, or by*

by pouring Water upon him; but by Immersion, that is by dipping or plunging in the Water.

A Second Scripture considerable is that of *John* 3. 23. *And* John *was Baptizing in Ænon near* Salim: And the Reason why he pitch'd upon this place is given; *because there was much Water there.* *Piscator* upon the place, tells us: *This* (saith he) *is mentioned to signifie the Ceremony of Baptism, which* John *used in Dipping or Plunging the whole Body of a Man standing in the River; Whence he saith, Christ being Baptized by* John *in* Jordan, *is said to ascend out of the Water.*

A Third Scripture worthy our notice is, *Acts* 8. 36. 38. *As they went on their way, they came unto a certain Water, and the Eunuch said; See here is Water, and they went down both into the Water, both* Philip *and the* Eunuch, *and he Baptized him. And when they were come up out of the Water,* &c. Upon which place *Calvin* saith; *We see what Fashion the Ancients had to Administer Baptism; for they Plunged the whole Body into the Water. The use is now* (saith he) *that the Minister casts a little Water only upon the Body, or upon the Head.*

A Fourth Scripture we shall mention, is *Rom.* 6. 4. *Buried with Him in Baptism:* Where the Apostle elegantly alludes to the Ceremony of Baptizing into Death, and Resurrection with Christ. *Calvin* upon the place saith; *Thus we are* Buried *with Him by Baptism into Death; by our Burying he declares our Death from the Ceremony of Baptism; because he who is Baptized is put under the Water, and by this carries a Similitude of him that is buried, who is put under the Earth. Now because none are buried but dead Men; from this very thing that we are buried in Baptism, we are Assimulated to Christ buried, or when he was buried.* Keckerman Syst. Theol. l. 3. c. 8. *Says that Immersion, not Aspersion, was the first Institution of Baptism, as it doth plainly appear from* Rom. 6. 3. *The* Assemblies *Annotations upon the place do say, That in this Phrase the Apostle seemeth to allude to the Ancient manner of Baptizing, which was to dip the Party Baptized, and as it were to Bury them under Water for a while, and then to raise them up again out of it, to represent the Burial of the Old Man, and our Resurrection to newness of Life.* The like saith *Piscator* and *Diodate upon the place.*

Dr. *Cave* also a great Searcher into *Antiquity*, in his late Book called *Primitive Christianity* saith, p. 320. *That the Party Baptized was wholly Immerged, or put under Water, which was the almost constant and universal Custom of those times; whereby they did most notably, and significantly express the great end and effect of Baptism,* &c.

And most remarkable is the Testimony that Mr. *Baxter* himself gives to this Truth. *As to the manner* (saith he) *It is commonly confessed by us to the Anabaptists, as our Commentators declare; That in the Apostles times, the Baptized were dipped over Head in Water; though we*

have thought it lawful to disuse the manner of dipping, and to use less Water. In his Third Argument against Mr. *Blake.*

All which Arguments, from the *Genuine Sense* of the Word *Nature* of the Ordinance, usage of the *Ancients*, were excellently inculcated by the Learned Dr. *Tillotson*, in a Sermon Preached at the Lecture in *Michael's Cornhill, London. April* 15, 1673. From *Rom.* 6. 4. *Therefore we are Buried with Him by Baptism into Death*, &c. Proving from thence *that Dipping or Plunging was the proper Ceremony and Rite in the Ordinance. And how* naturally *Arguments did arise from that* Sign *in Baptism, to inforce* Holiness *and* Mortification, *the Thing* Signified *thereby.*

Therefore to alter this Rite from *Dipping* to *Sprinkling*, spoils quite the *Symbole*, and makes it another thing. And you may as well take a Wafer Cake, or a whole Loaf to represent Christ's broken Body, as sprinkling a little Water to represent or figure out, his and our Death, Burial, and Resurrection by. And how cometh it to pass that many are so exactly curious, about that other Ordinance of the *Supper*, so as to make the gesture of Kneeling a ground of Separation; and yet to be so Negligent and Inconsiderate in *this?* And if it be Evil in Papists *not to break Bread, nor to Eat*, but to lift up, shew, and Swallow down whole the Host; when Christ did *break Bread*, and bade *eat it*; then it necessarily follows that it is as Evil when He bids *Baptize*, not to do it, but to *Rantize*; and instead of Baptizing into the Name of Christ, Dead and Risen, to Water him that hath no Understanding thereof: So that when the Minister saith, *I Baptize thee*, to an Infant, and doth no more, he speaketh that which is not *true*, and *deceives* those that take it at his Word for *Christian Baptism.*

So that thus then we have distinctly and plainly proved you to be defective both in respect of the *Internal*, and *External Constituent* parts of this great Ordinance; that is both in *Matter* and *Form*; both which are *Essentially* requisite to the true *Constitution* or *Being* of it: by which it is manifest, that Infants Baptism is a meer *Nullity*, and that which *Christ will not own.* And if it be said, that the *right Words* of Baptism were used, it being done *in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.* We Answer, that so there was also in Baptizing of *Bells*, and *Churches*; which yet in your own Judgment is so far from making it a *right Ordinance*, the *true Subject* being wanting, that it is no less than a great *Prophanation* thereof, and a miserable taking *the Name of God in vain.* And therefore certainly Jesus Christ one Day will discover that he takes it not kindly at the Hands of his Professed Friends, that of their *own Heads*, and without *his Warrant*, upon a Presumptuous Supposition of *unwritten Indulgence*, having taken it upon them to alter the Subject, as well as the *manner* of the Administration of an Ordinance so *Sacred* and *Venerable* as Baptism is.

As

As for the Cavils of *unseemliness, and hazarding of Health to the weak*, in the way of our present Practice; as they are the Fruits of *Carnal Wisdom* and *Unbelief*; so it is no other than to reproach the *Wisdom* of Christ that so Ordained it; telling us (however the World may call it undecent) yet that thus it becometh us, as it did himself, to fulfill all *Righteousness*. And as they that have or shall see the Decency of the Practice, will find Cause sufficiently to Vindicate it from the Reproach of Unseemliness, and be able to convince Gainsayers of their Unchristian Slanders in that Respect: So as for the hazarding of Health to the Weak; the constant, and known Experience of Thousands, doth amply refute it as a groundless Suggestion.

THE

THE
THIRD PART.

Containing ſome Animadverſions on Mr. Sidenham's *Treatiſe of* Baptiſm; *wherein that of Infants is further Diſproved. Together with ſome further Reflections on Mr.* Allen's *forementioned Diſcourſe to the ſame Purpoſe. Whereunto is Annexed an Anſwer at large, unto Mr.* Baxter's *chief Argument for the Church-memberſhip of Infants, from the Nature of the Covenant made with* Iſrael, *in the Land of* Moab, Deut. 29. *where Children are Repreſented as Fellow-Covenanters with their Parents; which (ſaith he) was a* Covenant of Grace, *or* Goſpel Covenant; *And therefore neither it, nor the Church-memberſhip of Infants which was built thereon, Repealed.*

SECT. I.

WE ſhall begin with Mr. *Sidenham's* Treatiſe. And *Firſt*, Whereas Mr. *Sidenham* pretending to Anſwer that Argument of ours. *That there is no expreſs Command, nor any poſitive Example in all the New Teſtament, concerning the Baptiſm of Infants.* For the Refutation thereof, He tells us, *That this Argument is built on this falſe Principle; That no direct Conſequences from Scripture are Mandatory, and ſo obliging and of Divine Authority.* Whereas we affirm no ſuch thing, but

but only say; *That in all Positive or Instituted Worship, such as Baptism is, which hath no other Rule nor Reason, than the meer will of the Law-giver, there must be either an express Command, or an express Example to enforce it:* In all other Respects we justly allow such proper Consequences as are deducible from the Scriptures, for the enforcing of Duty, or for the Comfort of God's People: For therefore is Preaching, Expounding, and Searching the Scripture appointed unto us. But as it would have been a Sin for *Abraham*, upon bare Consequences only, and without an express Warrant, to have Circumcised his Children: So it would be no less so to us, without the same Divine Warrant, in respect of Baptism. And therefore Mr. *Sidenham* doth not well to say; *That we may as well argue, That because Abraham was Circumcised when 99 Years old; Therefore old Persons are to be Circumcised, and none else: As because grown Persons were Baptized, therefore not Infants.* Whereas he knew, *Abraham* had an express Command, as for the Circumcision of himself, so for his Infants also: Which is that which we justly affirm to be wanting under the Gospel, in respect of Baptism.

SECT. II.

§ 1. BUT then Mr. *Sidenham* doth also tell us; *That it is to be considered, that there is nothing in all the New Testament against the Baptizing of Infants, no hint from any express Word drops from Christ, or his Apostles, nor any Phrase, which doth forbid such an Act.* p. 1. And this Argument, both he and others do lay very much stress upon. But then Mr. *Sidenham* should have considered; That it is the Opinion of divers able and godly Divines: That what is not commanded in the Worship of God, is forbidden: And that every Affirmative command of Christ, includes a Negative. For (saith *Tertullian*) *This is a certain Rule; if it be said 'tis lawful, because the Scripture doth not forbid it; It may equally be Retorted; It is therefore not lawful, because the Scripture doth not command it.* And herein therefore consisted the Sin of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, *Lev.* 10. who were destroyed for offering strange Fire, *which God had not Commanded.* They might have said, *Lord 'tis true, Thou hast not commanded this strange Fire:* But as thou hast not *Commanded* it; so neither hast thou *Forbidden* it. And by the same Reason might *Abraham* have Circumcised his Children on the seventh day, as well as on the eighth; because God had not forbidden it. For though God had commanded it to be done on the eighth day; yet he had no where expresly forbidden the seventh. But since the eighth day was expresly appointed,

and not the seventh, though the seventh was no where expresly forbidden; therefore *Abraham* was bound to the former, and not to the latter; and it would have been his Sin to have varied from the Rule prescribed him. In like manner we say; The Baptism of Believers is expresly commanded; That of Infants is not commanded; and therefore though it be not forbidden, yet since 'tis not commanded, it would be our Sin to practise it. And so in the Passeover: Whereas God commanded a Lamb, a Male of the first year to be eaten; they might as well have made use of an Ewe, or a Ram of the second or third Year, because not forbidden; no express Word of God had forbidden it. So when *David* and the People of *Israel* had made a new Cart for the Carriage of the Ark, which was to have been born on the Priests Shoulders only; and when God smote *Uzzah* for holding the Ark, they might as well have Pleaded, that neither of these was expresly forbidden: But yet nevertheless, *For this Cause the Lord made a Breach upon them, for that they did not seek him after the due order* that he had expresly appointed, 1 *Chron.* 15. 13.

§ 2. We find no where in all the Scriptures; That ever any express Word dropt from Christ or his Apostles, to the Prohibiting or Forbidding of Crucifixes, Beads, Altars, Praying to Saints, Pictures in Churches, Pilgrimages; Which things are still in use among *Papists*; but disowned by Protestants, because not commanded, though not expresly forbidden. The like may be said concerning Bowing at the Name of Jesus; the Cross in Baptism; Surplices in Preaching; Kneeling at the Sacrament; set Forms of Prayer. In respect of which it is no proper Argument; that therefore these things are lawful to be used in the Divine Service, because not forbidden; For as they are not forbidden, so neither are they commanded: Which is the very Argument made use of by the Generality of Dissenters, for their Justification, in Opposition to Prelatical Incroachments. *And therefore thou art Inexcusable O Man! For wherein thou Judgest another, thou Condemnest thy self*, Rom. 2. 1. There is no express Word of God against the Communicating of Infants in the Lord's Supper; And yet you your selves do not therefore count it lawful to admit them to that Ordinance, without an express Word to that purpose. And lastly, Bells are not expresly forbidden to be Baptized; and yet we do not reckon that a sufficient Argument for such a Practise. And whereas it is Objected as to this; That Bells are not *Subjectum Capax*: A fit or capable Subject for such an Ordinance; we would then ask, wherein lies their Incapacity? Cannot a Minister sprinkle a little Water upon a Bell, and use the Words of the Institution in as solemn a manner as he does when he Baptizes a Child? Or are they incapable for want of an Institution? We say the same of Infants. And if you say, they are not capable of the uses and ends of Baptism, as Men

are;

are; We Anſwer, If God had pleaſed, He could have made them by an Inſtitution, capable of ſome ſacred Uſefulneſs; yea, capable of Relative Holineſs, as well as *Aaron*'s Bell: Or the Bells mentioned, *Zech.* 14. 20. upon which it was written; *Holineſs to the Lord.* But it is well known, there are thoſe in the World, who think themſelves as wiſe as others, that judge Bells capable Subjects of Baptiſm, and have done ſo diverſe Ages.

§ 3. Thus you ſee what Abſurdities follow this Poſition, That *thoſe things are lawful in God's Worſhip, which are not forbidden by any expreſs Word, dropt from Chriſt or his Apoſtles.* But ſurely God is more *jealous* of his *Honour*, and *tender* of his *Worſhip*, than to leave it to *Our* Pleaſure. And that God hath in all Ages teſtified his diſlike, yea, Abhorrence of *Will-Worſhip*, and that for this very Reaſon, becauſe he hath *not Commanded it*, is too evident to be denied. For this cauſe God threatens Judgments upon his People of Old. *Ezek.* 43. 8. *They have ſet their Threſholds by my Threſhold, and their Poſts by my Poſt; wherefore I have Conſumed them in mine Anger.* Wherein we cannot but obſerve, that God diſcovers his ſevere diſpleaſure againſt them, not for neglecting any part of his Worſhip that *he had Commanded them*; But for their *Preſumption* in *adding* ſomething thereto, which *he had not Commanded them.*

§ 4. And indeed *Will-Worſhip* muſt needs be a great Sin, when the ſame Perſon who is to perform the *Obedience*, ſhall dare to appoint the *Laws*; Implying a peremptory Purpoſe of no further *Obſervance*, than may conſiſt with the Allowance of his *own Judgment*: Whereas true Obedience muſt be grounded on the *Majeſty* of that Power that *Commands*; not on the *Judgment* of the *Subject*, or Benefit of the Precept propoſed. Divine Laws, ſuch as are the *Poſitive Inſtitutions concerning God's Worſhip*, require Obedience not ſo much from the *Quality* of the things commanded, as from the *Authority* of him that commands them. We are all Servants of God; and Servants are but living Inſtruments, whoſe Property is to be governed by the Will of thoſe in whoſe Poſſeſſion they are. *Will-Worſhip* and *Superſtition*, well they may flatter *God*; they cannot pleaſe him. He that requires us to deny our ſelves in his Service, doth therein teach us, that his Commands ſtand rather in *fear* than in *need* of us; In fear of our *Boldneſs*, leſt we abuſe them; not in need of our *Judgment* to *Poliſh* or *Alter* them. The Conqueſt of an Enemy without the *Command* of the General, coſt a *Roman* Gentleman his Life, though his *own Father* were the Judge. So the over-wiſe Induſtry of the Architect, in bringing not the *ſame*, but as he thought, a fitter piece of Timber than he was commanded to the *Roman Conſul*, was rewarded with nothing but a *Bundle of Rods.* So jealous and diſpleaſed are even men themſelves, to have their own Laws undervalued by the

private

private Judgments of those who rather *Interpret* than *Obey* them. Much more *Impious* then will it be for us, to mix *Humane Inventions*, and Appointments of our own, with the *Institutions of God*, and to Impose them as Divine Duties, with a necessity of Obedience; whilst by that means, we take Christ's Divine *Prerogative* out of his Hands, and make our selves *joynt Authors* of his Ordinances, or rather the *Destroyers* of them: For to practise an Ordinance otherwise than Christ hath Instituted, is not to honour *Christ*'s Appointments; but an *Idol* of our own making. Now this the Apostles durst not do. They tell us, *that they declared the Counsel of God*, but nothing else. And *Paul* tells the *Corinthians*, he delivered nothing unto them, but what *he had received from the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. And sure he did not receive Infants Baptism from the Lord: For he never declares it to them.

§ 5. This therefore should be a Boundary to all Christ's Ministers, that they deliver nothing to the People, but what they have *recieved from the Lord*. That Faith that was *once delivered to the Saints*, must be Preached and contended for, but nothing else. And if Christ's Ministers have not received Infants Baptism from the Lord; and if they cannot prove that it was once delivered to the Saints, it is not to be Preached. As for all humane Mixtures in God's Worship, they are useful only for these two purposes, either to slacken and abate something that is *Excessive*, or to supply something that is *Deficient*. And so all Heterogenious Mixtures do plainly intimate, either a *Vitiousness* to be *Corrected*, or a *Defect* to be *Supplied*. Now it were a great Impiety to charge either of these upon the pure and perfect Word of God; and by Consequence to use Deceit, by Adulterating of it, either by such Glosses, as diminish and take away the force of it; or by the Addition of Humane Traditions, as may argue any defect. So that to stamp any thing of a Humane Original, with a Divine Character, and obtrude it upon the Consciences of Men; to take any dead Child of ours, as the Harlot did, and lay it in the Bosom of the Scripture, and Father it upon God; to build any Structure of ours in the Road to Heaven, and to stop up the Way; is one of the greatest Presumptions that the Pride of Man can aspire unto. To Erect a Throne in the Consciences of his Fellow Creatures, and to counterfeit the great Seal of Heaven, for the countenancing of his Forgeries, is a Sin most severely provided against by God, with special Prohibition and Threatnings. See Deut. 12. 32. *What thing soever I Command you, observe to do it; Thou shalt not add thereunto, nor diminish from it.* Deut. 18. 20. *The Prophet that shall speak a Word in my Name that I have not Commanded, even that Prophet shall die.* Prov. 30. 6. *Add not unto his Words, lest he Reprove thee, and thou be found a Liar.*

§ 6. And

§ 6. And yet further to demonstrate, *That Will Worship is a Sin of no small Magnitude*, consider the following Particulars.

First. It clearly proceeds as the Fruit of Pride. Men Love to have something of their own in God's Worship. They are not content with what the Infinite Wise God *commands* them; but will Presumptiously be adding something of their own thereto. The Second Commandment shews that Man is prone to be *medling* and *making* something in Worship, till he *marres* all. *Israel provoked God with their Inventions.* Psal. 106. 29.

Secondly. *Will Worship is a Sin greatly displeasing to God:* For God is not *pleased* with any thing in Worship which is not his *own:* Nay the contrary is that which he hath signified to be greatly provoking to him. In this Respect, it is not the *Work of Mens Hands*, nor their *Heads* that can be at all Acceptable unto God. That which pleases God must come from God. what he *Appoints* he *Approves*, and nothing else.

Thirdly. *Will Worship*, and Mixtures of Mens Inventions with Gods Pure Ordinances, are the great Canons that batter Cities, and the Gun-Powder that blows them up. Those bring the Lord of Hosts to War against them. It was the Calves that wounded *Israel*, and laid their Cities waste. *Hosea* 10. 5. *The Inhabitants of Samaria shall fear because of the Calves of Bethaven.* 'Tis highly probable, *Jeroboam* might plead that he kept still to the Articles of Faith, and Fundamentals of Religion, worshipping with Reverence the God of his Fathers: Making Alterations in things meerly Ceremonial, whereof no Express Law forbidding; and being variable as time, place, and person gave occasion. But however, he might mince the Matter, as others do in like Circumstances; yet God being a Jealous God, would not admit such Innovation, and Varying from his pure Worship, but Rejects it. And in particular, he is Rebuked, *For Offering upon the Altar which he had made in Bethel the* 15th. *day of the* 8th. *month; even in the Month which he had devised of his own Heart.* 1 Kings 12. 33. So *Isa.* 24. 5, 6. *Because they have transgressed the Laws, and changed the Ordinance, therefore hath the Curse devoured the Earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate; therefore the Inhabitants of the Earth are burned and few Men left.*

Fourthly. *Will Worship Grieves God.* Ezek. 6. 9. *I am broken with their Wanish Heart.* Their Superstitious and Corrupt Mixtures did not simply *displease* God; but *Oppressed*, *Afflicted*, and *Broke* his Heart. Great Injuries enter deep, and eat up the Spirits of any they are done unto. And what greater wrong can be done unto God, than to Invent and Impose that he never commanded in the Matters of his Worship? Yea it draws away the Heart of Men from God, and therefore they are said *to go a Whoring from God by their Inventions.*

Fifthly,

Fifthly. *Will Worship is a Work of Darkness*, Ezek. 8. 12. *See what the Ancients of the House of Israel are doing in the dark.*

Sixthly. *Will Worship* is that which God will not Honour with his presence: Neither Christ nor the Angels will be present at it. *Teach them* (saith Christ) *to Observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you alway.* If we step out of Christ's *way*, and *go a whoring* after our own *Devices*; neither can we groundedly expect the blessing of Christ's *Presence.*

Seventhly, and Lastly. *Will Worship*, such as *Infants Baptism* is, having no Institution in the Word of God; is not only Evil in its self, but stands aggravated with this Circumstance, that it *makes void the Commandment of God*: For *Will Worship* doth usually oppose, or justle out some part of God's true Worship; as *Infants Baptism* doth that of *Believers.* And so Christ told the Pharisees, upon another like Occasion; That *they made void the Commandments of God by their Tradition.*

SECT. III.

§ 1. WHereas Mr. *Sidenham* affirms; that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. was a pure Gospel Covenant, to which the Seal of Circumcision was annexed. From hence he draws this Inference. *That if that Covenant were a pure Gospel Covenant, reaching Gentile Believers, and their Children, as well as* Abraham *and his*; *then we cannot be denied the External Sign and Seal of the same Covenant: For* (saith he) *though the Outward Signs may be changed*; *yet there is no Change of the Priviledges, if the Covenant Remain entire.* p. 9, 10.

§ 2. We Answer; *First*, There is no Evidence in all the New Testament of any *Seal* which God intended should be annexed unto the Gospel Covenant, but that of the *Holy Spirit* only. Much less are we left at Liberty to put what Mark, Sign, or Cognizance, we please, upon our Infant Seed; under the Notion of an Ordinance of Christ, or as a Gospel Seal, without his Special Direction and Appointment.

§ 3. *Secondly.* It cannot be denied, but that *Circumcision* which was at first the Sign of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and which was afterward annexed to the Covenant made at *Sinai*, is now Abolished. And it is as plain, that the Covenant, both the one and the other, which Circumcision was Annexed unto; was a *Bondage Covenant*: For so the Apostle assures us *Gal.* 4. 24. So likewise *Gal.* 5. 1, 2, 3. *Stand fast therefore in the Liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not intangled again with the Yoke of Bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that*

that if ye be Circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing: For I testifie again to every Man that is Circumcised, that he is a debtour to do the whole Law. Now Circumcision being Abolished, and the Covenants also, whereunto it was Annexed, *Heb.* 8. 7. 13. there can be no just Inference drawn from the manner of God's dealing with them, to conclude that thus it must be now; it being an undue Supposition to conceive that the Proposition between *Abraham* and his *Fleshly Seed*, in the time when Circumcision was *in date*, should be the same to *Abraham* in the *Spirit*, which is *Christ*, and the *Carnal Seed* of every Believer, in that Season, when Circumcision is *out of date*.

Thirdly. Though it is Evident, that the Church of the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, in Respect of the Inward and Spiritual part of either, are both the same, without any Variation, as is also the Covenant of Grace, on which both are founded; yet it doth not therefore follow, that there is no Variation or Change in Respect of External Administrations: It being Evident, that the External Priviledges the *Jews* once boasted of are now Repealed; their former Pretentions to Church-Ordinances upon the Account of their *Birth-Priviledge*, being now broken *down*. Else, why doth *John* the *Baptist* tell them as he doth. *Mat.* 3. 8, 9. *Think not to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father.* They had *Abraham* to their Father, as much now as before: But now it was too late for them to use that Plea any longer: And there was good Reason why. *For now* (saith he) *the Axe is laid at the Root of the Trees: Every Tree therefore that bringeth not forth good Fruit must be hewn down.* Now the *Axe* is laid, *&c.* It seems then that the *Axe* was not laid at the Root of the Trees till now: But now the *Axe* must do its Work of that Kind; and so must the *Gospel Fan* also, at an other-guess Rate than formerly they had Experienc'd; inasmuch, as Jesus Christ was now Resolved *throughly to purge his Floor, and to gather the Wheat*, only *into his Garner* the Church. So that from hence it plainly appears, that though the Church for the inward Substance of it, is still the same that ever it was; yet as the Signs are changed, so there is as manifest a Change, in Respect of the External Priviledges, belonging to the one and the other of them.

SECT. IV.

§ 1. MR. *Sidenham* doth indeed tell us; *That the forementioned Scripture*, Mat. 3. 7, 8, 9. *Concerns only the* Adult, *or Men at Age*; *the* Scribes and Pharisees, *who were degenerated from* Abraham's *Faith, a* Generation of Vipers: *And therefore rejected by* John *when they Desired to be Baptized of him. So that* (saith he) John *did not Refuse them*

them because Abraham was their Father; *or upon that Account that* Abraham's Seed had no Right to the Promise; *But only as* pretending Abraham *to be their Father, when they walk'd contrary to the Principles of* Abraham's Faith.

§ 2. For the clearing of which, there are 3 Questions to be demanded.

First. Why doth Mr. *Sidenham* say, that *John* did not *Refuse* them, because *Abraham was their Father*? Who ever affirmed, that *John* refused *them*, because *Abraham was their Father*? But as *John* did not *Refuse* them on *that Score*; so it is as evident, that neither would he now *Receive* them on *that bottom*. It cannot be denied, but that at the *command* of God, this was the *ground* of their Admission *before*, because *Abraham was their Father*; and this they *still* insisted on: But now (saith he) *Think not to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father*, &c. whereby he plainly lets them know, that *that Plea* would *no longer* avail them on that Account.

Secondly, Why doth Mr. *Sidenham* say, that *John* did not refuse them, *upon that Account that Abraham's Seed had no right to the Promise*? We know of none that so affirm: But this we say; That as their *Interest in the Promise*, was not the Adequate, formal, or proper Reason of the *Circumcising* of them; (for *Ishmael* and others were to be *Circumcised*, to whom none of the *Promises* in *Abraham*'s Covenant did *belong*: as is plain from *Gen.* 17. 21, 23. whereby 'tis evident, that the true Reason why any were Circumcised, was the *Command*, not *Interest in the Promise*) The like we say in respect of Baptism.

Thirdly, Why doth Mr. *Sidenham* say, That *John refused them*, because they only pretended *Abraham* to be their Father? For were they not *Abraham*'s *Natural* Off-spring now, as much as ever? And was not that the ground of their Admission formerly? We do not say, they were *Abraham*'s Off-spring in a *Spiritual* sense, so as to walk in the *steps* of their Father *Abraham*: For that was not the *Ground* of their Admission *formerly*; but the ground of their Admission then, was meerly by vertue of the *Command of God*, as they were *Abraham*'s *Natural Seed*. The Question between us therefore, is only this; Whether because *Abraham*'s *Natural* Off-spring, barely as such, were by the *Express Command of God*, admitted to *Circumcision*; Therefore *without the like Command*; so must ours to *Baptism*?

§ 3. 'Tis true Mr. *Sidenham* tells us; That *John* rejected the Scribes and Pharisees from Baptism: *Because they only pretended* Abraham *to be their Father*; *when they walk'd contrary to the steps of* Abraham's *Faith*. But then why were not such as these rejected *before*? For certain it is, *none* were rejected from *Circumcision*, how vile, or prophane soever. There was then no *Faith* nor *Repentance*, nor *Fruits meet for Repentance*, at all required of any to be admitted into

the

the *Jewish Church*; whether they were *Children*, or Men at *Age*; It was enough in that respect, barely to be of *Abraham's Seed*, or *Family*; though only as *Servants born in his House*, or *Strangers bought with Money*; without any other Consideration. But *now* not so. *Now* saith *John*, *You must bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance*, if you expect to be Baptized with the *Baptism of Repentance*. For to this purpose he bespeaks them. *Verse* 10. *And now also*, (saith he) *is the Axe laid unto the Root of the Trees; therefore every Tree that bringeth not forth good Fruit, is hewn down.* Plainly intimating, that their *Birth Priviledge* was now to be pulled up by the *Roots*; And God would no longer take it as he had in *Times past*; since now nothing short of their *Actual Fruitfulness* in the Paths of Righteousness would serve the turn. A clear Argument that the *External* Administration of the Covenant, or the *Grounds* of Admission to the Priviledge of *External* Church-Membership, are now quite altered, to what they were in *Abraham's* Time.

§ 4. And indeed, for this very Reason is it, that the *Natural* Posterity of *Abraham*, are to this day rejected and Excluded from any Participation of *Gospel-Church Ordinances*; as it is apparent they have been for many Generations; whereby 'tis evident, that the *Birth-Priviledge*, they formerly so much insisted on, and gloried in, is *now at an end*, and the Date thereof expired. And certain it is, that not only are those at *Age* rejected, but their *Children* also upon the same *Ground*; *viz.* for want of that *Actual* Faith and Fruitfulness, which the Gospel now requires. For otherwise it cannot be denied, but that both *Parents* and *Children* also, have as fair a Title to *Abraham* their *Father*, as any of their *Progenitors* ever had: But we see this *Birth Priviledge* of theirs, though it stood them instead, as to their Admission into the *Legal* Church, their *Unbelief* and *Unfruitfulness* notwithstanding; yet it avails them not under this more *pure* and *Refined* Administration of the *Gospel*: But both Parents and Children also, are now *broken off*, and have no right upon the *former Terms only*, of standing any longer as *Members* of the *Visible* Church.

§. 5. And clear it is, that even you your selves would be apt enough to reject an *Infant* begotten of *Jewish* Parents from *Christian* Baptism, until *capable* of making an *Actual Profession* of the Christian Faith. And for the same reason you ought as well to refuse those born of *Christian* Parents, 'till capable of making the same *Profession*: Because in respect of *Parentage* or *Natural* Descent, the *Jewish* Infants have as *much* to plead as *ours*, and it may be *more*; since they are descended from *Believing Abraham*; who is called *the Father of the Faithful*, or *the Father of all them that Believe*: Which is more than any besides can pretend unto.

SECT. V.

SECT. V.

§. 1. AS for Mr. *Sidenham's* Argument for Infants Baptiſm from *Mat.* 19. 13. 14. We deny not, but do believe that Jeſus Chriſt hath a moſt compaſſionate regard to *Children* and *little Infants*; and it is our duty therefore to *bring them to him*, by Prayer and Supplication for them. But yet notwithſtanding this, we dare not *bring them to ſuch a Goſpel Ordinance as Baptiſm* is, unleſs Chriſt had *expreſly* Appointed, and called *them to it*; or ſignified his Pleaſure that *this Way they ſhould have come unto him*. Mr. *Sidenham* tells indeed, *That the Reaſon why the Diſciples forbad and rebuked thoſe that brought thoſe Children unto Chriſt. could not be out of any* Cruelty *to Infants, or that they had no Bowels for them, or Affections to them*. But (ſaith he) *It muſt be from ſome ſuch* Principle *which thoſe of a contrary Judgment take up; That they were not* capable, *and were firſt to be* Taught; *That only grown* Men, *and* Profeſſors *of* Faith, *were fit for Ordinances: And therefore* they rebuked *or chod them, and* forbade them *to do ſo any more: As if they had ſaid; What have we to do with* Children *as to* outward *Ordinances? They are not* capable; *they cannot* Profeſs their Faith; *and we muſt have Perſons able to hold* Forth Chriſt's Goſpel, *which muſt be the* viſible *Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom.*

§ 2. But then Mr. *Sidenham* contradicts himſelf, and ſpoils all again afterward; when he tells us, 'That whereas Chriſt took up thoſe In-'fants in his Arms, and laid his Hands upon them; it cannot be un-'derſtood, but in one of theſe 3 Senſes; either *Firſt*, in order to the 'Cure of Diſeaſes by a Miraculous Power. *Secondly*, for *Conſecration* of 'any to any Divine Work and Service; or *Thirdly*, for *Confirmation* 'after Baptiſm. And to this purpoſe (ſaith he) may we apply Chriſt's 'Act to theſe Infants, to *confirm* the Promiſe ſolemnly after *Baptiſm*. 'For (ſaith he) It was moſt generally uſed after *Baptiſm*; and pre-'ſuppoſeth baptiſm to *Precede*. And (ſaith he) Let any that differ 'from us, ſhew any where in the Goſpel, when Chriſt *laid his Hands* 'upon any Perſon, in this latter Senſe, *Unbaptized*. Wherein he doth expreſly take it for granted, or at leaſt he doth ſtrongly ſuppoſe, that theſe Infants had been already *Baptized*; and that this *Act* of Chriſt, was for their *Confirmation after* Baptiſm. Now if thoſe Infants had been *already* Baptized, it muſt have been Adminiſtred to them, either by *Chriſt himſelf*, or his *Diſciples*; Not by *Chriſt himſelf*, who as Mr. *Sidenham* grants, *Baptized none*. And if they had been already *Baptized* by the *Diſciples*, (which muſt be by vertue of ſome *Special Order*, or *Commiſſion* from Chriſt) Then how doth this agree with what Mr. *Sidenham* had ſaid before? When he tells us, *p.* 91. 'That the reaſon why the Diſciples *forbad* and *rebuked* thoſe 'that brought theſe Children unto Chriſt, muſt needs be from ſome

ſuch

'such *Principle* which those of a contrary Judgment take up; that they 'were not *capable*, and were first to be *Taught*; that only *grown Men*, 'and *Professors of Faith* were fit for Ordinances. For if they had been *already Baptized* upon Christ's *special Order* to that purpose to them; (which must be supposed if they had been Baptized at all) there had been then no *room* for such Scruples as these; Neither is it any way *likely*, that they would have at all *Rebuked* those that brought them; but rather have *encouraged* them so to do, and have been *helpful* themselves to have *Introduced* them into Christ's Presence, in order to the obtaining his *Benediction* on them, *after the Administration* of so Solemn an Ordinance.

§. 3. So that this doth clearly demonstrate to us, That at least, these little Children were not *then* Baptized; nor indeed can *this* Scripture be intended *at all* as a *Rule* unto us to that purpose: where nothing of *Baptism* is at all *mentioned*, or can at all rationally be *Supposed* to have been *Practised*, either by *Christ* or his *Disciples* upon this Occasion. That they had not been Baptized by *Christ himself*, is evident from the very Letter of the Text; He *Himself Baptizing not*: And that they had not been Baptized by the *Disciples* is also as plain: for otherwise they had not express'd the *unwillingness* they did that *such should be brought unto Christ* for their *Confirmation after Baptism*; which as we see Mr. *Sidenham* doth so ungroundedly suppose had been *already* Administred unto them. Let us then bring our Infants to Christ in the way that *himself* hath appointed: But let us not of our *own Heads* Administer such an Ordinance as *Baptism* to them, without his special *Warrant*; lest we incur the guilt of *Will Worship*; and lest he say unto us at last, as he did unto the Jews upon another Account; *Who hath required these things at your Hands?*

But whereas Mr. *Sidenham* tells us, p. 99. *That as for* grown visible Professors, *they are but* probable *Members themselves; and yet must we with scorn, poor probable Disciples our selves, deny a little Water* to Infants.

§. 4. To this we Answer; We do not with *scorn* deny a little Water to Infants, or with *scorn* reject them from *Christian Baptism*; but it is the meer Conscience of our *Duty and Allegiance to Christ*, that makes us refrain without his *special Warrant* so to do; as being afraid of *Prophaning* so Sacred an Institution as *Baptism* is, by misapplying it to a *wrong Subject*. And whereas Mr. *Sidenham* calls grown, visible Professors, *but probable Members*; We acknowledg that it is at best but a Judgment of *Probability* or *Charity*, that we can at all pretend unto in our admission of any such to Baptism: But then it cannot be denied, but that we are upon the *surer ground* when according to Christ's Rule we admit only *grown visible Professors* thereto, who besides that *Birth Priviledge* which you so much insist upon (which *they* may equally pretend unto as well as *Infants*) are capable of making also a *verbal*

Profession of their Love to Christ, with an answerable Conversation; So that it cannot be denied but that we have a greater ground of hope that *unto such belongeth the Kingdom of God*, who have this *double Advantage*, than we can have in respect of *Infants*, who have *only a pretended Birth Priviledge* to be insisting on; and concerning whom there is no Word of God that gives the least Warrant for their admission to *Baptism* upon that Account: For however some of them may belong to the *Election of Grace*; and though our Saviour doth assure us, that *of such is the Kingdom of God*; yet this is no sufficient ground to Administer *Baptism* to them, 'till capable of making an answerable *Profession*, as the Gospel directs. And therefore we do not refuse to Baptize them from a Principle of *Scorn*, as Mr. *Sidenham* suggesteth, but because we dare not *take the Holy and Dreadful Name of God in vain*, as it useth to be by those who presume to *sprinkle Water upon the Face of an Infant, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, without his *special Direction* or Appointment, in that respect. For as we have seen that the present Scripture doth not prove it; So neither doth any other that we can meet with, give any *Warrant* or *Countenance* at all unto such a *Practice*.

SECT. VI.

§. 1. MR. *Sidenham* Arguing from the Institution. *Mat.* 28. 19. tells us, p. 128, 129, 130. *That if that place be the Prime Institution of Baptizing* (*from which place, we Exclude Infants, where Christ useth such universal and Comprehensive Expressions*) *We shall desire* (*saith he*) *but to deal with them on their ground, and the same Text will Serve to prove our Positions, more demonstratively than theirs. And this Text* (*saith he*) *shews that Christ gave Commission to the Apostles and Ministers* to Preach and Baptize, *but in what* order *to do it; or what should be required, or the qualification of the* Subject, *as absolutely Necessary, is not at all discovered in this Scripture. They must look for another Text to Exclude* Infants, *besides this; Else give up their Confidence. Either* (*saith he*) *this place is the full and Exact Rule, or Institution of* Baptizing *or it is not: If they say it is; then it would discribe the Persons and the maner; The matter and the* form *of Baptizing, and that in the usuall Phrase with other Scriptures: But here is only a* General Commission *to two great Acts, viz. To* Preach, Teach and Baptize. *And we may say in the same place, That whoever are* outwardly Taught, *or do but* hear *the Gospel* (*though they walk never so contrary*) *must be Baptized: For the Commission is,* Teach and Baptize. *Nothing of the Parties* Entertainment of it *is mentioned in this* 28 Mat. *nor of the* qualification of the Subject, *with any distinguishing Character. If they say, This doth not hold forth all the Institutions in every particular* (*as they must grant*) *then we may compare other Scriptures with this, to make out the* full *Institution; as these* [illegible] *Infants* where *are*

are mentioned with so much Gracious Consideration, as hath been formerly expres'd.

§. 2. This we Reply, That notwithstanding all the Confidence which Mr. *Sidenham* here expresseth; both the *Qualification* of the Subjects of *Baptism*, as also the *manner* or *form* of *Baptizing*, are *sufficiently* set forth unto us in the present *Institution:* For;

First, If we enquire after the *Subject*; It is plain by this Commission that none are to be Baptized, but such as are *Taught*, so as to be *Discipled* into the true *Faith and Profession* of Christianity. *Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them*, &c. *Infants* being *uncapable* of being thus *Taught*, or *Disciped*; they are therefore Excluded: But all others that so hear the Gospel, as to understand it, Believe it, and be Discipled by it, are according to this Commission to be Baptized. But whereas Mr. *Sidenham* tells us, 'That whosoever are outwardly *Taught*, or 'do but *hear* the Gospel (though they walk never so *contrary*) must 'be *Baptized*; inasmuch as in the *Commission*. *Mat.* 28. *nothing* of the 'Parties *entertainment of it* is there mentioned. With what shadow of Truth could Mr. *Sidenham* utter such a Sentence? When he could not but know; that as according to that very Institution, *Mat.* 28. Such as are *Discipled* by the Preaching of the Gospel are there appointed to be Baptized. *Go Teach all Nations*, &c. That is, as your selves have acknowledged, *Disciple all Nations, Baptizing them.* So in that parallel place. *Mark.* 16. 16. (which is but a rehearsal of the same Commission by another of the Holy Pen Men) our Saviour there tells us; *He that Believeth and is Baptized shall be Saved.* Plainly shewing, that those that are to be Baptized must be such, *as so hear the Gospel*, as to give a *Believing entertainment to it.* He had said before, *Go Preach the Gospel to every Creature*, And then it immediately follows, *He that Believeth and is Baptized shall be Saved.* And if here be not a plain notice given of the *qualification* of such as are to be admitted to *Baptism*; Let such Judge whose Eyes are open.

Secondly; if we enquire after the *manner* or *form* of *Baptizing*, the very *Word* it self is plainly significant of Christ's Mind and Meaning therein. *Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them*; that is, let them be *dipt or plunged under Water*; which is the *native Sense* and *signification* of the *Greek* Word, which we Translate *Baptize*, as hath been already proved. So that whatever Mr. *Sidenham* tells us; the *Commission* which Christ gave to his Apostles concerning *Baptism* doth afford *sufficient Direction*, both in respect of the *qualification* of the *Subject*, as also in reference to the *manner* of the *Administration* thereof.

§. 3. As for the rest of the Arguments made use of by Mr. *Sidenham* for the support of Infants Baptism, from the *Nature of the Covenant made with Abraham*, from *Acts* 2. 39. From *Col.* 2. 11, 12. From the *Analogy between Circumcision and Infants Baptism*; From the Baptizing,

of the several *Households* mentioned in the *New Testament*: As also concerning the *Signification and Use of the Word, Baptism.* Enough hath been already said in the first and second Parts of this Discourse for the Refutation of them, which needs not here to be repeated. Only there are two Arguments in Mr. *Allen's* Treatise before mentioned, which were then omitted; but must now be Answered.

SECT. VII.

§. 1. THE first hath Reference to those several Titles of a *Holy* and *peculiar People*, which are frequently in the Scripture given to the whole Body of the *Jewish Nation, Church* and *People*; from whence he infers, that there is no such difference as we affirm there is, between the *Old* and the *New Testament* Churches. For (saith he) 'If 'those *terms* are frequently given in the Epistles to Church Members 'now, the same *Epethites* are frequently given to the Members of the 'Jewish Church. And therefore there is no such *Difference* as is Imagi-'ned in the *Constitution* of either of them, they being both alike *Spiritual.*

§. 2. To this we Answer; First, If there be no *difference* between the Old and New Testament Churches, in respect of the *Constitution* of either of them; but that there was the same *Purity, Holiness*, and *Spiritu-ality*, in the one, as in the other; Then what needed, or wherein consisted that *Reformation*, which the Apostle tells us was to take place in the *Gospel day.* Heb. 9. 8, 9, 10. *The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first Tabernacle was yet standing; which was a Figure for the time then present: In which were offered both Gifts and Sacrifices that could not make him that did the Service perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience; which stood only in Meats and Drinks, and divers Washings, and Carnal Ordinances, Imposed on them until the time of Reformation.* Plainly Intimating that there were many things *faulty* among them, and many things *defective* also, which were to be *Reformed, Rectified*, and *Supplied*, when the Day-light of the *Gospel* was to *break* upon them. And upon this account, not only doth the Spirit of God *find fault* with the *Covenant it self* which they were then under, which therefore was now to be *done away*, and a *new One* to take place. Heb. 8. 7, 8, 13. But for this Reason also was the *Seed to be changed.* The *Carnal* Seed being *rejected*, and only the *Spiritual* Seed of *Abraham* admitted as Members of the Gospel Church. A plain notice of which Change is given by *John* the Baptist, the Harbinger of the Gospel Dispensation. Mat. 3. 7, 8, 9, 10. *Think not* (saith he) *to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father; For I say unto you, that GOD is able even of these Stones to raise up Children unto* Abraham. *And now also the Axe is laid unto the Root of the Trees; therefore every Tree that bringeth not forth good Fruit, is hewn down.* Plainly requiring a *personal* and *actual* Fruitful-

ness

ness in all the Members of this *new Church state*; which is exclusive not only of all those that are such as the Pharisees and Sadducees were, whom he was now speaking to, who were a *Generation of Vipers*, and were actually debauch'd in their Conversations; but of all such also, as were either *neglective*, or are uncapable (as is the Case of *Infants*) of *actual* Fruitfulness in the Paths of Righteousness.

§. 3. So that when you tell us that the Legal and Gospel Church are alike Spiritual: We say not; For it is plain there was no such *Inquisition* concerning the *good* or *bad* qualities, the Fruitfulness, or Unfruitfulness of the Members of the former Church, in order to *Admission* thereinto. It was enough barely to be of *Abraham's Seed* or *Family* to be so esteemed: But *now* saith *John*, *the Axe is laid unto the Root of the Trees*; And they must all be *hewn down* under the Gospel, that have nothing else to pretend unto but that of a *Godly Parentage*; which plainly excludes *Infants*, as well as all other unfruitful Branches from the Gospel Church. And to this same purpose is it that he doth further assure them: ver. 12. That Jesus Christ was now resolved with the Gospel *Fan to Purge thoroughly the Floor* of the Gospel Church; and to *gather the Wheat into His Garner*. Under the Law, and before also, even in *Abrahnam's* time, the *Chaff* and the *Wheat* remained together unsevered; but now the *Fan* must go to Work. We read of no such Fanning *Work* in the *former* Church state. And to what purpose is it else that Christ told the Woman of *Samaria*, as he doth. *Jo.* 4. 23. *The Hour cometh, and now is, when the true Worshippers shall Worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth: For the Father seeketh such to Worship Him?* Which plainly sheweth that God expecteth now greater Purity, Exactness, and Spirituality, in such as were to approach His Presence in the Celebration of *Gospel Worship*. And indeed of this the whole fifth of *Mat.* is a sufficient and convincing Proof, giving clear evidence concerning the *refinedness* and *spirituality* of the Gospel Administration above and beyond that of the *Law*. For then (saith our Saviour) it was thus and thus; but I am come to tell you a *New* Doctrine, and do call you up to greater *Purity* and *Strictness*.

§ 4. *Secondly*, We Answer, That that *Holiness* which was ascribed unto the whole Body of the *Jewish* Nation, was a *Typical, Ceremnial Holiness*; and was no other than was ascribed to the whole *Land, City, Temple, Altar*, and divers other things, and is therefore now *Abolished*. For if all things under the Law were but a *Figure and Shadow of good things to come*, then such was the *Holiness* of the Jewish *Nation* and *People* also. Now this the Apostle in the 9th and 10th Chapters to the *Hebrews*, proves at large, shewing that all things under the Law; all the Priviledges of the *Old Covenant*, with all the Perquisites, Dependancies, and Appurtenances thereunto belonging; are called by such Names, as make them evidently appear to be *Typical*. As

First,

First, they are called a *Figure*. Heb. 9. 9. *Which was a Figure for the time then present*. So verse 24. *For Christ is not Entered into the Holy Place made with Hands, which are the Figures of the true*. Secondly, They are called a *Pattern*. Heb. 9. 23. *It was necessary that the Pattern of things in the Heavens*, &c. Thirdly, They are called a *Shadow*. Heb. 10. 1. *For the Law having a Shadow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things*, &c. Now the *Holiness* of the Jewish Nation being an *Appurtenance* belonging to the Law, or the Old Covenant. It was but a *Figure*, *Pattern*, or *Shadow of all good things to come*, and was therefore *Typical*, and is now *Abolished*. And if we will know what the *Holiness* of the Jewish Nation did serve, to *Typifie* or Represent unto us; It is evident, that as it *Typified the Holiness of Christ himself*; So of all *Abraham*'s Spiritual Seed, who are made *Holy* by *Believing* in Christ.

§ 5. The Time of *Reformation* therefore, spoken of in the fore-mentioned Scripture. *Heb.* 9. 8, 9, 10. *being come*; wherein those Imperfect Gifts and Sacrifices, with all those *Carnal* Ordinances which were for a Season *Imposed* on the Jewish Nation, were to be done away; and the Gospel-Church taking place in the *Room thereof*: It cannot rationally be supposed, but the one doth far exceed the other, at least, in *Purity* and *Inward Glory*: For by how much Christ hath now obtained *a more excellent Ministry* than that of *Moses*; and by how much also *he is the Mediatour of a better Covenant, Which is Established upon better Promises*; as the Apostle affirmes. Heb. 8.6. By so much of necessity must the *gospell* Church exceed in *lustre*, *beauty*, *Refinedness* and *Spirituality*, the *former* Administration.

SECT. VIII.

THE Second Argument in Mr. *Allen*'s Book, remaining to be Answered, is this; 'That all Persons, and so little Children, 'that were of the Legal Church, must needs, in one Respect or other, 'have been Persons of a *Religious*, or *Spiritual* Consideration. And 'this considered (saith he) I know not upon what better to place the '*Visible* Church-Membership of *Infants*; or to Attribute it to, than 'God's *Electing*, and *Calling them to his People*, and their Parents *De-*'*dicating* and *Devoting* them to God, and his Service. And the Scrip-'ture useth to reckon little Children, as having begun to do this or 'that, when they are but placed in Circumstances, that will bring 'them to it *Actually* in the *Issue*. And thus *the Children of the* Koha-'thites, *of a Month Old, were numbred with their Fathers, as with them* 'keeping *the charge of the Sanctuary*, when they were but in a way of 'being trained up to it. And for the same Reason, *little Children* 'were said to enter into *Covenant* with God when their *Parents* did 'so. *Deut.* 29. 11, 12

§ 2. To this we Answer; *First*, By granting that it was in a *Religious*

gious Consideration, that *Children* were then *Admitted* Members of the *Legal* Church: But yet it doth not therefore follow, that they are to be *admitted* Members of the Gospel-Church; for the Reasons before rendered: The *Terms* of *Admission* into *that*, being far more *strict* and *Spiritual*, than were *those* under the *Law*.

Secondly, Whereas he tells us, That the Reason of their *Admission* into the *Legal* Church; was God's *Electing*- and *Calling them to that Priviledge*. This we also grant: But then we also say, that though the *Call* and *Election of God*, in Reference to the *Inward Substance* of the *Covenant of Grace*, or to an *Invisible* Membership in the *Invisible* Church, is *Invariable*; It doth not follow, that the *Gifts* and *Callings of God* in Reference to *External* Membership, are therefore also *Invariable* or *Irrevokable*; (as is afterward by Mr. *Allen Asserted*; and unto which we have already in the Second Part of this Discourse given a sufficient Answer.) For we find by undeniable Evidence; that those *External* Gifts and Priviledges that the *Natural* Posterity of *Abraham* were once *Invested* with, are now *Rescinded*, *Repealed*, and *Repented of*; and it cannot be affirmed, that in any *Religious* Capacity whatsoever, they are now at all owned by God, as his Church and People, as once they were, neither Parents nor Children: But for the most part remain broken off, and Unchurched to this Day. And if you say, That *they and their Children being broken off, We and our Children are Ingraffed in their Room*; This is that which remains to be proved; and indeed the contrary is manifest, as hath been already with abundant Evidence Demonstrated, in the foregoing Parts of this Discourse; since the Axe of the Gospel is *now laid unto the Root of the Trees*; *and every Tree that bringeth not forth good Fruit, is hewn down*, in respect of any further Church Priviledge, which before was Indulged unto them: which clearly cuts off the pretence of *Children* unto any such Priviledge under the Gospel, as well as all other *Unfruitful* Branches.

Thirdly, Whereas he tells us of their Parents *Dedicating* and *Devoting* them to God, and his Service; And that *the Children of the Kohathites of a Month Old, were numbred with their Fathers, as keeping the charge of the Sanctuary*: And that for the same Reason, *little Children were said to enter into Covenant with God, when their Parents did so.* Deut. 29. 11, 12. To this we Answer; That it is indeed a very Pious and Commendable thing, for Parents to *Dedicate* and Devote their Children to God, and his Service; and to this Purpose, to train them up, as soon as they are capable *in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord*. But it doth not therefore follow, that they can fully be Reputed *Church-Members* now, till *Converted*, and *wrought upon* by the Preaching of the Gospel unto them, whatever they were under the Law, as hath been before demonstrated.

§ 3. And though the *Kohathites* of a Month Old were numbred

with their Fathers, *in keeping the charge of the Sanctuary*, Evident it is, that this was the proper Work of the *Kohathites*, by God's special Direction in their several *Generations*; and as they became to grow up to the *Competency* of Years, an *Actual* discharge of that Duty was required of them; This being an *External* Service, which by God's special Direction, was *peculiarly* Incumbent on all that were of that *Lineage*: But what signifies this, to prove the Church-Membership of *Infants* under the Gospel?

§ 4. And as little signifies that which follows, when he tells us, That for the same Reason, *little Children were said to enter into Covenant with God, when their Parents did so*, Deut. 29. 11, 12. For though 'tis true, *thus* it was under the *Law*; yet this proves not the Point in dispute: For as we have already said; That Covenant which God made with his People *when he took them by the Hand to lead them out of the Land of* Egypt, *because of the Faultiness of it, is now Abolished. That Covenant*, saith God, *they brake, they continued not in it, and I regarded them not.* So that though *Infants* were *Visible Members* of the *Legal* Church; yet that was by a *Positive Law*, and that which is now *Abolished*. Shew us the like now, or you say nothing.

SECT. IX.

MR. *Baxter* indeed tells us in his Book, called, *Plain Scripture Proof of Infants Church-Membership and Baptism*, p. 57, 58. That the Covenant mentioned in the fore-cited Text, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. Where Children are Represented as Fellow-Covenanters with their Parents, was a *Covenant of Grace*, or a *Gospel-Covenant*; and that therefore, neither it, nor the Church-Membership of Infants, (which, saith he, was built thereon, or inseparably Conjunct) is repealed. For thus runs his Argument. ['My 12th Argument (saith he) is from the forementioned Text, in *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. where all the Jews 'with all their little ones, were entred into Covenant with God: 'From whence I argue thus; if the Covenant which those Infants who were then Church-Members, were entred into with God, was a *Covenant of Grace* (or a *Gospel-Covenant*,) then it is not Repealed, (and consequently their Church-Membership is not Repealed, as being built on the Covenant, or inseparably Conjunct.) But the said Covenant which the Infants who were then Church-Members did 'pass into, was a *Covenant of Grace*, (as distinct from the *Law* 'which is Repealed.) Where by the way, it may be observed, that 'though Mr. *Baxter* affirms the Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 29. to be 'a *Covenant of Grace*, or a *Gospel-Covenant*, yet he doth here seem 'plainly to grant, that the Law, or *Sinai* Covenant, was no other 'than a *Covenant of Works*, and accordingly now Repealed. Where-'in Mr. *Baxter* is undoubtedly in the right; though he therein directly contradicteth Mr. *Roberts* his Notion, who affirms the *Law* 'or

'or *Sinai* Covenant it self, to be a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus. 'The unsoundness whereof, we shall have Occasion to discover in the 'following pars of this Discourse. Therefore neither it, nor their 'Church-Membership is Repealed.]

So that if we can substantially prove, that the Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. was not a *Covenant of Grace*, nor a *Gospel-Covenant*; but a legal Covenant, and that which is now Repealed; from hence it will unavoidably follow, and that according to Mr. *Baxter*'s own Concession, that the Church-Membership of Infants (which as himself affirms, was built thereon, or inseparably Conjunct) is also Repealed with it.

§ 3. Now that the Covenant there mentioned (though there was Grace in it, as there was in all the Covenants that God ever made with Men) is not a Covenant of Grace, properly so called, whereof Christ is the Mediatour; nor a Gospel, but a Legal Covenant; is Evident; forasmuch as it is no other than a Repetition, or Renewal of the Covenant made with that People in *Horeb*, or at Mount *Sinai*; *when God took them by the Hand to lead them out of* Egypt; which was first mentioned, *Exod.* 19. and that in the very Words and Terms as it is there Expressed: That Covenant being now again solemnly Repeated, and afresh Transacted between God and them, in *Deut.* 29. as is manifest by comparing *Exod.* 19. 4, 5. with *Deut.* 29. from the 1st to the 13th *Verse*. As also, the 24th and 25th verses of that Chapter. And accordingly, whereas in the first verse of this 29th of *Deut.* We are there told, *These are the Words of the Covenant, which the Lord commanded* Moses *to make with the Children of* Israel, *in the Land of* Moab, *beside the Covenant which he made with them in* Horeb. Mr. *Pool* in his Annotations upon this Text, paraphraseth the words thus: "These are the Terms or Conditions, upon which God hath made, that is, renewed Covenant with you. The Covenant (saith he) was but one in Substance, but various in the time and manner of its Administration: And indeed as it is Evident that it is the same Covenant for Substance; that was first made with them in *Horeb*: So it is as Evident from the words themselves in this forecited text. *Deut.* 29. 1. That it was not a Covenant of Grace, properly so called; but a Covenant of Works, or a Legal Covenant, which God renewed with the *Israelites*, in the Land of *Moab*; since *Moses* was the Mediator of it; In which respect, we are there expressly told, that *these are the words of the Covenant which the Lord commanded* Moses *to make with the Children of* Israel *beside the Covenant he made with them in* Horeb. Whereas the Covenant of Grace, properly so called, hath no other Mediator than Christ himself. 1 *Tim.* 2, 5. Who is therefore said to have Obtained *a more Excellent Ministry*, viz. *than that of* Moses; *by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which is established upon*

upon better Promises. Heb. 8. 6. *Besides, we are expressly told.* Jo. 1. 17. *That the Law was given by* Moses; *but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ.* From whence; it plainly follows, that the Covenant insisted on, was not a Covenant of Grace, properly so called, not only for as much as *Moses* was the Mediator of it; But also forasmuch as the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, is here so plainly Contradistinguished, or opposed thereunto.

§ 4. But that this Covenant, which by the Mediation of *Moses* was thus Solemnly renewed and afresh transacted between God and them, in the land of *Moab*; was plainly a Covenant of Works, or a Legal Covenant; will be yet further undeniable, by comparing *Exod.* 19. 5. with *Deut.* 29. 9. and both with Lev. 18. and *Rom.* 10. 5. For as in *Exod.* 19 (Where that Covenant is first mentioned which God made with *Israel*, by the Mediation of *Moses*, in *Horeb*, or at Mount *Sinai*; which the Apostle speaks of *Heb.* 8. when God took them by the hand to lead them out of *Ægypt*) He there tells them ver. 5. *Now therefore if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all People: for all the Earth is mine.* So in like manner, upon the same terms, and by the hand of the same Mediator, is the same Covenant afterward renewed with them. Deut. 29. 9. *Keep therefore* (saith God there unto them) *the words of this Covenant, and do them, that you may prosper in all that you do.* Now that both these were but two several Repetitions of the same Covenant of Works, the Apostle plainly shews. *Rom.* 10. 4. 5. *Christ* (saith he there) *is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth: For* Moses *describeth the Righteousness of the Law, that the man which doth these things shall live by them,* which he citeth from *Lev.* 18. 5. Where the Lord tells them, *you shall therefore keep my Statutes and Judgments, which if a man do he shall live in them.* The same with *Exod* 19. 5. and *Deut.* 29. 9. And the same Apostle also assures us. *Gal.* 3. 10. that *as many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curse; for it is written* (saith he) *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are in the Book of the Law, to do them.*

§ 5. Now it having been thus proved that the Covenants Mentioned in both these forenamed Scriptures, were made by the hands of the same Mediator *Moses*; And that they were both also of one and the same tenor, requiring *perfect Obedience* as the *Condition* of Obtaining the Promised Mercy; And forasmuch as St. *Paul* doth so plainly assure us, that this was no other than a Covenant of *Works*, and that which he Contradistinguisheth or opposeth to the *Righteousness of Faith*, or the Gospel Covenant, which he afterward speaks of *ver.* 6, 7, 8, 9. of the same 10*th* to the *Romans*. From hence it plainly follows, That the formentioned Covenants, both that in *Deut.* 29. as well as that in *Exod.* 19. (which were but two several Repetitions of the same Covenant of Works;) are now Repealed, and done away in Christ:

For

For ſo he doth plainly aſſure us. *Heb.* 8. 8, 9, 13. where he tells us; That *if that firſt Covenant had been faultleſs, then no place ſhould have been ſought for the ſecond: For finding Fault with them, he ſaith, Behold the days come ſaith the Lord, when I will make a New Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and the Houſe of* Judah; *not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers, in the Day when I took them by the Hand, to lead them out of the Land of* Egypt, *becauſe they continued not in my Covenant, and I regarded them not.* And verſe 13. *In that he ſaith, a New Covenant he hath made the firſt Old. Now that which decayeth* (ſaith he) *and waxeth old is ready to vaniſh away.* From whence it is plain that the old Covenant he there ſpeaks of, which God made with his People when he took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of *Egypt*, mentioned *Exod.* 19. 5. and *Deut* 29. 9. for the faultyneſs thereof is now Aboliſhed: *For there is verily* (ſaith he) Heb. 7. 18. *a diſannulling of the Commandment going before, for the Weakneſs and unprofitableneſs thereof.* Upon which Account a New Covenant was to take place, which was to be Eſtabliſhed upon *better Promiſes.*

§ 6. And therefore though 'tis true, in *Deut.* 30, 6. (which Mr. *Baxter* urgeth, and alledgeth to prove, that the Covenant mentioned Chapter 29. is a Goſpel-Covenant) The Lord then promiſeth that *he will Circumciſe their Heart, and the Heart of their Seed, to love the Lord their God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul, that they might live.* Which are plainly Goſpel Promiſes, yet it is evident, that that is a diſtinct Covenant from that mentioned Chapter 29. the one being *Conditional*, the other *Abſolute*: And it is as evident, that the Promiſes therein contained, were not to be fulfilled, till after the Lord had turned their threatned Captivity, for their Breach of the Covenant he now made with them; and till after he had returned and gathered them from *all the Nations*, and from *the outmoſt Parts of Heaven, whether they ſhould be ſcattered*; and from whence the Lord there promiſeth to gather, and to fetch them, as it is plainly Expreſſed in the 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5th Verſes of that Chapter, compared with the 24th and 25th Verſes of the 29th Chapter, which was never yet fulfilled.

§ 7. But ſaith Mr. *Baxter* [Did God Promiſe Spiritual Grace to the Jews after the Captivity and not before? Was not the Promiſe made to them that then were? Were not they Captivated oft in the time of the Judges, and ſo might at leaſt be made good then? If God would do as much for them before they forſook him, and broke the Covenant by Rebellion, as he would do afterward when they Repented; then he would Circumciſe their Hearts before as well as after: But the former is true, therefore the latter. Beſides, ſome Divines ſay that the Promiſe. *Deut.* 30. 6. is Conditional: And if it be on Condition of Obedience, than it was made to more than the Elect; and if it were

not performed to any but the Elect; no wonder, when it was a Conditional Promise, and the rest performed not the Condition, which God will Cause the Elect to perform.]

§8. To this we Reply; That as it is evident that the Promises mentioned *Deut.* 30. 6. are *Absolute*, and therefore Essentially different from those mentioned *ch.* 29. which were *Conditional*; so they are as clearly to be understood in Reference to *a time to come*; and cannot without palpable streining be applied unto the *time then present*; nor indeed unto any time since, unto this very day. For thus run the Words, *Deut.* 30. 1. *And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the Blessing and the Curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the Nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee?* ver. 2. *And shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy Children, with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul.* ver. 3. *That then the Lord thy God will turn thy Captivity, and have Compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the Nations whether the Lord thy God hath scattered thee,* ver. 4. *If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of Heaven; from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee.* ver. 5. *And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the Land which thy Fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it, and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy Fathers.* ver. 6. *And the Lord thy God will Circumcise thine Heart, and the Heart of thy Seed, to Love the Lord thy God with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul, that thou mayest Live.* ver. 7. *And the Lord thy God will put all these Curses upon thine Enemies, and on them that hate thee.* ver 8. *And thou shalt return, and obey the voice of the Lord, and do all his Commandments which I command thee this day.* ver. 9. *And the Lord thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine Hand, in the fruit of thy Body, and in the fruit of thy Cattle, and in the fruit of thy Land for good: For the Lord will again rejoice over thee for good, as he rejoiced over thy Fathers.* ver. 10. *Because thou shalt obey the voice of the Lord thy God in keeping his Commandments, and his Ordinances, which are written in the Book of this Law, when thou shalt return unto the Lord thy God, with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul.* For thus run the Words of this 10th. verse. according to the Old Translation, though they are rendred otherwise in the New.

§ 9. Wherein, *First*, we cannot but observe the *Absoluteness* of these Gospel Promises; since that which was the very *Condition* of the Legal Covenant; *Do this and live*; And *if ye be willing and obedient ye shall eat the good of the Land*, is here made a main branch of the *promised Blessing.* ver. 6. *The Lord thy God will Circumcise thine Heart, and the Heart of thy Seed, to Love the Lord thy God, with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul, that thou mayst Live.* And therefore when *Moses* tells them. *ver.* 1, 2. That *when all these things were come upon them, the Bless-*

sing

ſing and the Curſe which he had already ſet before them, and they ſhould call them to Mind among all the Nations, whither the Lord their God had driven them; and they ſhould return unto the Lord and obey his voice, with all their Heart, and with all their Soul, that then the Lord would return their Captivity. We are by no means to underſtand theſe Words as the *Condition*, upon the *Account* of which their Captivity ſhould be returned: For then indeed it had been all one with the Covenant of Works mentioned, *Exod.* 19. 5. *Deut.* 29. 9. or that mentioned *Gen.* 2. 16, 17. And had been failable, as that was: But theſe Words are plainly ſpoken by way of *Prediction*, rather, of what *ſhould be*; that at the ſame time when they ſhould thus obey God's voice, their Captivity ſhould be returned: But how? Is it left to an uncertainty. *If ye will obey my voice then ſhall your Captivity be returned?* No; for God undertakes even this alſo for them, to work up their Hearts to an anſwerable frame of Obedience, ſuitable to the Mercy to be beſtowed on them. And therefore to prevent their Jealouſie concerning any further forfeiture of the promiſed Bleſſing on their part, he is pleaſed to give them a full Aſſurance thereof by an *abſolute Promiſe*. ver. 6. *The Lord thy God will Circumciſe thy Heart, and the Heart of thy Seed, to Love the Lord thy God with all thine Heart, and with all thy Soul, that thou mayeſt Live.* And ſo alſo, *ver.* 8. *Thou ſhalt return, and obey the voice of the Lord, and do all his Commandments which I command thee this day.*

§ 10. Mr. *Baxter* indeed ſuggeſteth, that the Promiſes mentioned *ver.* 6. are *Conditional*, and therefore made to more than to the Elect. *And if* (ſaith he) *they were not performed to more than the Elect, no wonder when they were* Conditional: But that they are *Abſolute* and not *Conditional* is plain; ſince no *Condition* can be aſſigned of performing thoſe Promiſes, but that of the good Pleaſure of God's own Will; it being only brought forth as the Sovereign Effect of his own Purpoſe and Grace, and of that alone: For to ſay that God promiſeth to Circumciſe their Hearts, on *Condition of their Obedience*, is to put the *Effect* before the *Cauſe*: For therefore God promiſeth that they ſhall be *Obedient*, becauſe he will *Circumciſe their Heart*. (Neither indeed is there any true Goſpel Obedience, but what flows from that Principle:) And what Condition can there be of that, but that of the good pleaſure of God's own Goodneſs and Grace? Let the Heart once be Circumciſed, ſo as that God's People be made a *willing People in the day of his Power*, and then their Obedience naturally and neceſſarily follows; till that be done, nothing is done; when that is done, all is done. And this is that which God here promiſeth, *viz. To Circumciſe their Hearts, and the Heart of their Seed, to Love and Serve the Lord their God, with all their Heart, and with all their Soul.* Which therefore muſt needs be *Abſolute*; ſince no *Condition* can be aſſigned, whereby God ſhould be obliged to the performance thereof, but that of his own *Purpoſe and Grace*. Which being Obvious in the Words.

§ 11

§ 11. We must in the next place take notice of the Time appointed for the fulfilling of these Gospel Promises unto them. And that was not the time then present, as Mr. *Baxter* would have it: For (saith *Moses*, *Deut* 29. 4.) *The Lord hath not given you an Heart to perceive and Eyes to see, and Ears to hear, unto this day.* Nor in the time of the Judges, or the Prophets that followed after; nor indeed any time that is as yet past: But as *Moses* here tells them; *when all these things should have come upon them, the Blessing and the Curse* which he had before spoken of; which must of necessity refer to the latter times, or the last Age of the World, *when the Lord should turn their Captivity; return and gather them from all the Nations whether they should be scattered.* And so it is plainly expressed, *Deut.* 4. 30. *Woen thou art in Tribulation; and all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days,* &c. For it is plain that *Moses* aims not at this or that particular Captivity, either in the time of the Judges, before or after, among the *Philistines*, *Egyptians*, or *Babylonians*; since that had been of little Advantage to deliver them from one Captivity, to let them fall into another, and there let them stick for ever: But the Words of the Promise are of a most Comprehensive Latitude, *viz. If they be driven among all the Nations.* ver. 1. *Or any of them be driven to the outmost parts of Heaven.* ver. 4. *The Lord will gather them from all Nations.* ver. 3. *And will fetch them from the outmost parts of Heaven.* ver. 4. And it is plain, that as the Promise is of a great *Latitude*; so of a great *Length* also. For this gathering them is promised after the *Babilonian* Captivity. *Jer.* 29 1. *Jer.* 31. 10. Nay after Christ was come in the Flesh, it is delivered as a Prophecy. *Jo.* 11. 51. That *Christ should gather together into one the Children of God that were scattered abroad*; as a thing to be fullfilled in after times.

§ 12. And in this Respect therefore is it that the Prophet *Jer. Ch.* 31. 31, 32, 33. Reciting the same Gospel Covenant spoken of in the forementioned 30 *Deut.* Expressly Represents it as a thing future, or as yet then to come, as it had been before so represented, *Deut.* 30. *Behold the days come,* (saith the Lord) *that I will make a New Covenant with the House of* Israel, *and the House of* Judah, *not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of* Egypt (*which my Covenant they brake, although I was an Husband unto them.*) But *this shall be the Covenant that I will make with the House of* Israel *after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my* Law *in their inward parts, and write it in their Hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my People. And they shall teach no more every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his* Brother, *saying, Know the* Lord; *for they shall all know me from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord: For I will forgive their Iniquity, and I will remember their Sins no more.* Where we have the same Promises for Substance with those mentioned *Deut.* 30. 6. And to the same purpose the Apostle also Represents

presents it as a thing future, even after the Resurrection and Ascention of Christ. *Rom.* 11. 25, 26, 27. *I would not Brethren that ye should be Ignorant of this Mystery, that Blindness in part is happened unto* Israel, *until the fulness of the* Gentiles *be come in, and so all* Israel *shall be saved. As it is written; there shall come out of* Zion *the Deliverer, and shall turn away Ungodliness from* Jacob. *For this is my Covenant unto them, when I shall take away their Sins*; wherein, as we may observe that the Covenant he here speaks of, is of the same Nature with the Promises mentioned *Deut.* 30. 6. as also with those before mentioned, *Jer.* 31. So we cannot but take notice both there and here, of the Futurity of their Accomplishment; It being not to be fulfilled *until the Fulness of the* Gentiles *be come in. And so all* Israel *shall be saved.*

§ 13. And 'tis in vain to say that these Promises have already had their Partial and Gradual Accomplishment: For therein God promiseth not only to *Circumcise their Heart, but the Heart of their Seed also, to Love the Lord their God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul.* Which as it must of necessity comprehend the whole Body of that Nation, Young and Old, of all Sorts, Ages, and Degrees, from the least unto the greatest, none exempted: So it doth as plainly express a time and state of Perfection; which no particular Person, much less a whole Generation of God's People, in this World; they and their Off-spring also, could ever yet truly or justly pretend unto. To insist therefore upon a Partial or Gradual Accomplishment of those Glorious Promises; and thence to conclude, that they might be made good or fulfilled in *Moses* his time; or as Mr. *Baxter* saith, in the time of the Judges, or the Prophets that followed after; would be no other than to *darken Counsel by Words without Knowledge.* For as *Moses* doth expressly assure us that those Glorious Promises were not fulfilled in his time, *Deut.* 29. 4. *The Lord* (saith he) *hath not given you an Heart to perceive, and Eyes to see, and Ears to hear unto this day*; and as the Prophet *Jer.* is so far from owning any Accomplishment of them in his time, that he doth plainly acquaint us, that the Covenant was not so much as struck up, or as yet Actually made betwixt God and them: But as he tells us; 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will do it; So the Apostle *Paul* is as far from owning any Accomplishment of them in his Time: 'For until this day (*saith he*) remaineth the same vail untaken away, 2 *Cor.* 3.

§ 14. So that as it is clear, that the Mercies promised, *Deut.* 30. 6. were not fulfilled in *Moses*'s, nor in *Jeremy*'s, nor in the Apostle's Time; So there is no Experience or History that gives us any account that they were ever since fulfilled. And therefore neither indeed can we groundedly expect the Accomplishment of them till the second coming of the *Deliverer*, before spoken of, when that Prediction of the Apostle *Rom.* 11. 26. shall be fulfilled. 'And so all *Israel* shall be 'saved. And no wonder, for this will be no other than the time of the

New

New Heavens, and the New Earth, mentioned *Isa.* 65. 17, 18. 'For 'Behold I create new Heavens, and a New Earth, and the former shall 'not be remembred: But be you glad and rejoice for ever in that which 'I Create; for behold I create *Jerusalem* a Rejoicing, and her People a 'Joy; And the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor 'the voice of crying. And ver. 23. 'they shall not Labour in vain, nor 'bring forth for Trouble; for they are the Seed of the blessed of the 'Lord, and their Off-spring with them. With many other glorious Promises there Recorded, which are no way Applicable to the present state of things in the Heavens and Earth that now are. And indeed the whole 60th. *chap.* of *Isaiah* is taken up with Promises of this kind: And among the rest, we are told *ver.* 21. 'Thy People also shall be 'all Righteous, they shall inherit the Land for ever, the Branch of 'my Planting, that I may be glorified. *So Chap.* 61. 9. Their Seed also 'shall be known among the *Gentiles*, and their Off-spring among the 'People. All that see them shall acknowledge them that they are the 'Seed which the Lord hath blessed. All of them most plainly Promises that were never yet fulfilled, and therefore remain as yet to be Accomplished.

§ 15. And indeed hitherto are to be Referred the several Passages that lie dispersed up and down the Scriptures, concerning the Blessedness of the Seed of the Righteous: For though no doubt, God hath a Gracious Respect unto many that are the Natural Descendants of Believers now; and we may probably hope that the Grace of Election is for the most part continued in their Race; yet as God hath made no such Covenant with us, 'That he will be a God unto us, and to all 'our Natural Off-spring, during the present Administration of things, in the Heavens and the Earth that now are: So whatever Blessedness of that kind, God hath designed for his People, we have no Scripture ground to expect the Accomplishment thereof, nor the *Jews* neither, till the time of the *New Heavens, and the New Earth* before spoken of, *wherein* (as *Peter* tells us) *Righteousness shall dwell.* For then indeed, the People or Subjects of that state *shall be all Righteous, the Branch of Gods planting that he may be glorified*, both they and their Off-spring also. And therefore then, and not till then may we expect the fulfilling of those Gospel Promises before mentioned, concerning the 'Circum-'cising of the Heart, both of them and their Seed also, to Love the Lord 'their God, with all their Heart, and with all their Soul: Which bespeaks no other than a time and state of Perfection; when they shall have 'no need any more to Teach every Man his Neighbour, nor eve-'ry Man his Brother (as now we must, and therefore not to be understood of the present state of things) 'Saying, Know the Lord; for 'they shall all know him from the least unto the greatest of them.

From

§. 16. From all which, it clearly appears, that the Promises mentioned, *Deut.* 30. 6. are of a vastly different Nature, from what they have been generally imagined to be. And indeed are so far from being a part of the Legal Covenant at Mount *Sinai*; or of that Covenant which the *Israelites* with their little ones, were entred into, *Deut.* 29. That they remain as yet to be fulfilled. They might be Fulfilled, saith Mr. *Baxter* in the time of the Judges. But why then were they so oft Captivated in the time of the Judges, as well as afterward by the *Philistines*, *Ammonites*, &c? And why were the Ten Tribes after carried away Captive by *Salmanazer*, King of *Assyria*, So as that they have never since been hear'd of in the World, that we can understand? And why were the two Tribes afterward also carried away Captive by the *Babylonians*, and since Dispersed by the *Roman* and *Turkish* Powers; and so still remain in a State of Dispersion; as also in a State of Impenitency and Opposition to the Gospel unto this day? A few indeed were Converted by *John* the Baptist, and *Christ*, in the day of his first Appearance: But the Generality of the *Jews* were in Blindness after that, in *Paul's* time, *Rom.* 11. and still so remain. And what was the Conversion of a few to the Fulfilling of the All of these Promises to the All of the *Jews*. But as sure as God is True, and his Word most Faithful, there must be a time, when the forementioned Promises shall be Accomplished: When as the Fulness of the Gentiles shall come in, and be brought under the Obedience of *Christ*; So the Jews also must be Called, and the Fulness of them; by that *Deliverer* whom God hath promised shall yet *come out of Zion, to turn away Ungodliness from Jacob. For this is my Covenant unto them*, saith God, *when I shall take away their Sins.*

§. 17. And therefore, though Mr. *Baxter* saith true, when he tells us, p. 58. That *Deut.* 30. is a Gospel Covenant; since the Apostle, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. shews it in Express Words: ("For "saith he) when the Apostle had shewed, that the Righteousness "of the Law lieth in Perfect Obedience. *He that doeth these "things, shall live by them.* He then sheweth the Difference thus. "*But the Righteousness which is of Faith, speaketh on this wise:* "*Say not in thine Heart, who shall Ascend up to Heaven, to bring "down Christ from Above*, &c. *But what saith it? The Word "is nigh thee; even in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart; that is, "the Word of Faith which we Preach.* Now these words of "Faith (saith he) the Apostle Citeth out of this very Covenant, "*Deut.* 30. 11, 12, 13, 14. But then it doth not therefore follow, that the Covenant mentioned, *Deut.* 30. and that, Chap. 29. is one

and the same Covenant. Mr. *Baxter* indeed takes it for granted that they are one and the same: And therefore to prove that that mentioned in the 29*th*. Chapter is a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant; he Alledgeth these words in the 6*th*. ver. of the 30*th*. Chapter, for the Confirmation thereof; and hereon Bottoms his Argument; [as] "That because the Jews with their little Ones, were "entred into Covenant with God, in the 29*th*. Chapter, and consequently were all Church-members; and forasmuch as the Covenant which the Infants who were then Church-members did pass "into, was a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant, (as distinct "from the Law, which is Repealed;) therefore neither it, nor "their Church-membership is Repealed.

§ 18. It cannot be denied but this is a Principal Argument which Mr. *Baxter* urgeth for the support of his New Doctrine of the Church-membership of Infants, and consequently their Baptism under the Gospel: But how unjustly Urged, and how little it signifies to the Proof of what he intends it for, may by this time be easily Discerned; since by what hath been said, it plainly appears, that the forementioned Scriptures in *Deuteronomy*, which he Bottoms it on, are by him greatly Abused and Mis-represented, contrary to the plain Scope of the Spirit of God in them: The Covenant mentioned in the 29*th*. Chapter, and that in the 30*th*. being not one and the same, as he would have it, but two Distinct and Essentially different Covenants: The one being a Covenant of Works as hath been plainly proved, from *Rom.* 10. 5. which had Moses for the Mediator of it, *Deut.* 29. 1. For the Faultiness whereof it is now Abolished, *Heb.* 8. 13. The other, a Covenant of Grace, *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8. *Deut.* 30. 11, 12, 13, 14. which hath *Christ* alone for the Mediator of it, *Heb.* 8. 6, 7, 8, 9. And shall therefore never be Abolished, *Psal.* 89. 34, 35, 36. The one being plainly of a Legal Stamp; the other Evangelical. The one Conditional; the other Absolute. The one having its Existence but for a time, upon an Occasional Temporary Principle; the other suited to answer a Principle, Existing from Everlasting, to Everlasting. The one being appointed only for the time then present, till the Incarnation of *Christ*; the other respecting a time that is as yet to come. From all which it plainly follows, that the Covenant spoken of *Deut.* 30. 6. is Essentially different from that which the Jews with their Little Ones were then entered into Chap. 29. as being Established upon better Promises. So that there can be no just Inferrence drawn, that because Infants were Fellow Covenanters with their Parents under the Legal Administration, that thus it is now under the Gospel: For since it is Evident that the

the Law or Covenant it self *is changed*; (as the Apostle Expresly affirms it is, *Heb.* 7. 12.) It doth as plainly follow, that the Seed is changed: The Gospel Covenant that Believers are now under, requiring other manner of Subjects than the Legal did; as hath been already proved in the foregoing parts of this Discourse.

§. 19. 'Tis true, in the time of the New *Heavens* and the New *Earth*, before spoken of, God hath promised not only to *Circumcise the Heart of his People, but of their Seed also, to love the Lord their God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul.* That *they shall teach no more every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, saying, know the Lord: For they shall all know him, from the least of them, to the greatest of them.* That *they shall be all Righteous, they and their Offspring, also the Branch of God's Planting, that he may be Glorified.* But that will be such a time and state of Perfection, as we cannot now pretend unto. And therefore as the State and Condition of God's People now, is vastly different from what it was with them under the Law; so it is no less vastly different from that State of Blessedness, which both they and their Offspring also shall be Advanced unto, at the time before mentioned. So that what ever Priviledge the Offspring of God's People shall then be Invested with; It hath been already proved, that God hath now appointed, that such only as are Capable of making a Profession of Faith and Repentance, are to be accounted as Visible Members of the Gospel Church, according to the present Frame and Constitution thereof.

§. 20. To conclude the present Point: Since it hath been now so plainly proved; That the Covenant which the Infants who were then Church-members, did pass into, was not a Covenant of Grace, properly so called, whereof *Christ* is Mediator; nor a Gospel, but a Legal Covenant, or a Covenant of Works, and that which is now Repealed. From hence it unavoidably follows, (and that according to Mr. *Baxter*'s own Grant) that the Church-membership of Infants which was built upon it, or, as he saith, Inseparably Conjunct, is also Repealed with it. And since the main Pillar for the support of this new Doctrine, of the Church-membership of Infants under the Gospel, fails as it doth, it of necessity follows, that all the other Arguments which Mr. *Baxter* hath mustered up to the same purpose, to the number of no less than 26. and those again Multiplied and Sub-divided into a great many more, are all of them wholly Insignificant also: Since no other consideration whatsoever can sufficiently demonstrate the continuance of it under the Gospel, unless it could have been proved, that in its first Institution, it had a Gospel Covenant for the Foundation there.

But the Contrary having been so plainly proved, it follows with an equal necessity, (and that according to Mr. *Baxter's* own Concession) that there is no shadow of pretence left to assert the Church-membership of Infants under the Gospel Administration that now is. And if the Arguments for their Church-membership do all of them fail, as we cannot but see they do: From hence it also plainly follows, that the Practice of Infants Baptism, which is Built thereon, must of necessity fall to the Ground, as having no Scripture Foundation left it, for the Support thereof. And consequently it is as Evident, that Mr. *Baxter's* Book, called, *Plain Scripture Proof of Infants Church-membership and Baptism*; carries with it nothing else but an empty Title. *Vox & præterea nihil.*

SECT. X.

FRom what hath been already said, it appears, that Mr. *Baxter* and others, have much to Answer for, that they are guilty of such gross Mis-applications of the word of Truth, for the uphold ing of Infants Baptism, (besides the unrighteous charges of Murder and Adultery, which he and they have so strongly Laboured to fasten upon those of a contrary Practice from themselves in respect of Baptism) as is Evident in reference to the foregoing Argument; and as hath been already also manifested, in respect of his and their Corrupt Glosses upon *Acts* 15. 10. concerning the Discipleship of Infants. *Now therefore, why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples; which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear?* As if Infants were intended by the Disciples there mentioned; when not only in that Chapter, but in the whole New Testament besides, those only are meant by Disciples, who being taught, professed the Doctrine Preached by such a one; As *John's* Disciples, *Christ's* Disciples; the Disciples of the *Pharisees*, and the Disciples of the Perverters. And accordingly Baptism was Administred unto such as were made the Disciples of *Christ* by *Instruction*, and unto none other pursuant of the Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. as hath been sufficiently opened and Explained in the foregoing parts of this Discourse. And no less Blameworthy is he and they, in respect of their Corrupt Interpretations of those Scriptures, *Luke* 9. 47, 48. *Mat.* 18. 5. and *Mark* 9. 41. which speak of the *Receiving little Children in Christ's Name*, &c. As if all those Scriptures were intended of

of Young Sucking Infants; whereas, they are plainly spoken of such little Children only, as were capable of Believing in *Christ*; which tender Sucking Infants, after an ordinary rate, are utterly uncapable of. And therefore when *Mat.* 18. 2. we are told that *Jesus called a little Child, and set him in the midst of them*; and tells them, ver. 5. *Who so shall Receive one such little Child in my Name, Receiveth me.* It is Expresly Added ver. 6. *Who so shall offend one of these little ones that believeth in me*, &c. Whereby we may easily perceive what kind of little Children *Christ* would have us *Receive in his Name*, or under the Notion of his *Disciples*; not Infants, that are uncapable of Faith, or of Discipleship by Instruction, without which it is impossible (after an ordinary rate) to be a Disciple, according to the true and proper acceptation of the Word. But such little Children as did actually *Believe in Christ*. And who can deny but that such are *Christ's* Disciples, Church-members, and the proper Subjects of Baptism? And the very same Expression with that in *Mat.* 18. 6. we meet with, *Mark* 9. 42. *Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that Believe in me*, &c. Upon the very same occasion, ver. 37. the like Abuse hath been put upon those Words 1. *Cor.* 7. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they Holy.* As hath been already also Manifested in the foregoing parts of this Discourse; which needs not here to be repeated.

§. 2. As for Mr. *Baxter's* Argument for the Church-membership of Infants under the Gospel, from *Rev.* 11. 15. where we are told, that upon *the Sounding of the Seventh Angel, there were great Voices in Heaven, saying the Kingdoms of this World are become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.* Which (saith he) Includes Infants as well as others that were to be the Members of *Christ's* Church, or Kingdom. To this we shall only give this brief Reply; That this Scripture hath a plain reference to the time of the *New Heavens*, and the *New Earth*, which we have before spoken of; wherein all the Kingdoms of the World shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and all the Dominions of the Earth shall actually Serve and Obey him: For then indeed God hath promised, that *his People shall be all Righteous, they and their Offspring also, the Branch of his Planting, that he may be Glorified*, Isa. 60. 21. which cannot be applied unto the present Administration of *things in the Heavens and Earth that now are*; wherein we cannot say, that one of a Hundred, much less that the whole Race of Believers are subject unto the Scepter of *Christ*, and consequently far from the true Gospel Characters of Church-membership in the Gospel Church.

§ 3. As for Mr *Allen's* other Instance concerning the Covenant of the *Rechabites*; wherein the Infants as well as those of Age were Included: It is altogether as Insignificant in our present Case, as the former concerning the *Kohathites*; or his other Instance concerning those little Children who were said to *enter into Covenant with God when their Parents did so*, Deut 29. 11, 12, which hath been already Discussed. For doth it follow that because the Children of the *Rechabites* were Engaged in a severe Ceremonial Covenant, together with their Parents, that therefore the Children of Believers are comprehended with themselves in the Covenant of Grace? This would be indeed to make Christianity to be Hereditary: But certain it is, that Grace doth not now run in a Blood, what ever it shall do; neither is the Grace of God now Tied or Entailed unto any Lineage of Men whtsoever. Though if it could be proved that all the Children of Believers were really and absolutely Included in the same Covenant of Grace with their Parents; yet it follows not therefore that Baptism belongs unto them, till capable of making an Actual Profession of their Faith in Christ, as hath been already proved. For it cannot justly be denied but that the Administration of Ordinances depends meerly upon the Law of Institution, and hath varied in several Ages. From *Adam* to *Abraham* there was no Ordinance to be Administred to Infants. In *Abraham's* time indeed Circumcision was Instituted; which belongs peculiarly to the old Testament Administration, and was part of *Moses* his Law, which is now Abolished, and done away. This was the first Ordinance that was Administred to Infants, and not to all Infants, but only to Male Infants, living in *Abraham's* Family, if they did Live to the Eighth day; otherwise they had no Right to it; though many of them doubtless in the Covenant of Grace, and so Saved: For want of an Institution the like may be said of Infants now; many of whom are in the Covenant of Grace, and so Saved by virtue of the Free-Promise; yet not to be Baptized, if they do not live to the time of Repenting, and Believing, the only time appointed for Baptism. For none ever had a Right to the Administrations of the Covenant, any otherwise than by virtue of a Positive Law. Now if the Natural Branches the Seed of *Abraham*, had no Priviledge to be Circumcised, though in Covenant with their Father, but by virtue of a Divine Law, Expressly requiring the same; neither can we expect that our Infants should have any Right to Baptism, without the same Divine Warrant.

THE

THE FOURTH PART.

Wherein the Baptiſm of Infants is further Diſproved: By way of Anſwer to the Arguments made uſe of by Dr. Burthogge *and others, for the Support of that Practice. Wherein the Covenant made with* Iſrael *at Mount* Sinai, Exod. 20. *As alſo the Covenant of Circumciſion made with* Abraham, Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9. *(Whereon ſo much Streſs is laid for the Support of Infants Baptiſm) are plainly proved to be no other than two ſeveral Editions of the Covenant of Works. And conſequently that no juſt Argument can thence be deduced for the Juſtification of that Practice.*

Together with a clear and diſtinct Explanation of the true Nature and Difference betwixt the Two Covenants, that of Works, and that of Grace.

SECT. I.

WE ſhould here have put a Period to the preſent Diſcourſe, but that there remains yet ſomething further of great Importance, which requires a Solemn Diſcuſſion, and Determination, according to the Light that ſhall be afforded unto us from the

Holy Scriptures: And that is; Whereas Dr. *Burthogge* in his late Printed Discourse upon the Subject of Infants Baptism; Asserts (as many others have done before him) that the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. is the Covenant of Grace; or that Original Grant and Great Charter, by which Believing Gentiles always did and do claim Heaven and Earth, and all the Promises they have Title to. From whence he infers, that they are to keep God's Covenant in the Gospel Sign of it, that is Baptism; and that both by wearing of it themselves, and also by putting it on all theirs; as *Abraham* was commanded to do, in respect of Circumcision. And forasmuch as the Mistakes which the Generality of the World hath for some season Laboured under, in reference to the true Nature of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, in the fore-cited Text, have been the very Ground and Foundation of most of the Arguments, which have of late (at least) been insisted on in order to the Justification of Infants Baptism: We shall therefore the more Solemnly apply our selves toward a Substantial Discovery, or Detection threof; additional unto what hath been already offered in that respect, in the foregoing parts of this Discourse. And if it can be Substantially proved that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. was not a Covenant of Grace, nor a Gospel, but a Legal Covenant, or a Covenant of Works; and consequently that the Gentiles are not concerned therein: From hence it will unavoidably follow, that all the Arguments thence deduced, for the support of the fore-mentioned Practice, howsoever they may be formed, or framed, do of themselves fall to the Ground.

§ 2. In the first place then; though we do acknowledge, that God did indeed make a Covenant of Grace with Believing *Abraham*: Which is the Great Charter, by which Believing Gentiles always did, and do claim both *Heaven* and *Earth*, and all the Promises they have Title to; yet that the Covenant of Circumcision, (for so it is called by *Stephen*, *Act.* 7. 8.) which God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7. 8, 9, 10. (though there was Grace in it, as there was in all the Covenants that God ever made with Men, as hath been before noted) is not a Covenant of Grace properly so called; nor a Gospel Covenant, whereof Christ is the Mediator: And consequently that the Gentiles are not concerned therein, is thus proved.

If that Covenant was as much a Covenant of Works, as the Covenant of Mount *Sinai*, mentioned *Exod.* 19. 4, 5. and *Edod.* 20. and the Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 29. 9, 10, 11. Nay, as much as the Covenant made with *Adam* before his Fall, *Gen.* 2.

16.

16. 17. where God tells him; *Of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou ſhalt not Eat: For in the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely Die.* All which Were but ſeveral Editions of the ſame Covenant of Works; then it is not a Goſpel Covenant, nor a Covenant of Grace, properly ſo called; whereof Chriſt is the Mediator.

But it was as much a Covenant of Works as either of the Co-Covenants before mentioned were; therefore it is not a Covenant of Grace, nor a Goſpel Covenant, properly ſo called, whereof Chriſt alone is Mediator.

§ 3. That the Covenant laſt mentioned, *Gen.* 2. 16, 17. was a Covenant of Works: We ſuppoſe none will (or can at leaſt Rationally) deny: Foraſmuch as Life was Implicitely promiſed unto our Firſt Parent upon his Obedience, and Death was Explicitely threatned, or denounced upon him, in caſe of his Diſobedience. And upon theſe terms he was to Stand or Fall; which was plainly and undeniably a Covenant of Works, whereof Chriſt was not the Mediator. That the Covenant mentioned *Exod.* 19. 4, 5. and Ch. 20. which God made with the *Iſraelites* at Mount *Sinai*, was of the ſame Stamp; the Scriptures are every where full in the Proof thereof. And as clear it is, that the Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 29. 9, 10, 11. is but a Repetition of that made *Exod.* 19. *&c.* As hath been already proved. In reſpect of both which, it is Evident; that as Bleſſings were therein pronounced, and promiſed to the Obedient, upon *Condition* of their Obedience: So a Curſe was pronounced upon the Diſobedient. And thus *Paul* tells us, *Rom.* 10. 5. *Moſes deſcribeth the Righteouſneſs of the Law; that the Man which doeth theſe things ſhall live by them.* Which is a plain deſcription of a Covenant of Works; which he Citeth from *Lev.* 18. 5. *You ſhall therefore keep my Statutes and Judgments; which if a Man do, he ſhall live in them.* And accordingly the Apoſtle doth alſo tell us, *Gal.* 3. 10. That *as many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curſe: For it is Written,* (ſaith he,) *Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things that are contained in the Book of the Law, to do them.* And ſo likewiſe ver. 11, 12. *That no man is Juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God, is evident; for the Juſt ſhall Live by Faith. And the Law is not of Faith, but the Man that doeth them ſhall live in them.* Thoſe therefore that tell us that the Law is a Covenant of Faith, do plainly contradict the Apoſtle, who Expreſly tells us, that *the Law is not of Faith; but the man that doeth them, ſhall live in them.* And therefore plainly and undeniably a Covenant of Works. Thus it was with *Adam* in Paradice, when God gave him the

the Command before mentioned, *Gen.* 2. 16. and denounced the Sentence of Death upon him, in case of Disobedience; upon the Account of which, it is generally Acknowledged, that he was then under a Covenant of Works. It is Evident therefore, that the Covenant mentioned *Exod.* 19 and Chap. 20. and that mentioned *Deut.* 29. were but two several Repetitions of the same Covenant of Works made with our First Parent; and are frequently therefore in the Scripture Represented unto us under the Denomination of the *First, or Old Covenant*, *Heb.* 8. 7. 13. Ch. 9. 15. 18. there being therein a clear and a plain Manifestation of the Law written in the Heart of Man at the First.

§. 4. Now, that the Covenant of Circumcision made with *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. is of the same stamp or tenor with the three fore-mentioned Covenants, in *Gen. Exod.* and *Deut.* is also as Evident: For though 'tis true, God there promiseth *to be a God to Abraham, and to his Seed*; yet still it was upon Condition of Obedience, with an answerable threatning in case of Disobedience: As it was with *Adam* before the Fall. *In the day that thou Eatest thereof, thou shalt surely Die.* And as it was with them in the Wilderness; *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are Written in the Book of the Law to do them.* So here ver. 9. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations.* ver. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee; every Man-Child among you shall be Circumcised.* And ver. 14. *The Uncircumcised Man-child, whose Flesh of his Fore-skin is not Circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off from his People: He hath broken my Covenant.* The same terms with the former. Besides, it is Evident that Circumcision indispensibly Obliged all that were under it to a Perfect and Universal Obedience to the whole Revealed Will and Law of God, *Gal.* 5. 3. *For I testifie to every man that is Circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law.* If it was so in *Paul's* time, it was so in *Moses's* time: And then it cannot be justly denied, but it was so in *Abrahams* also, according to what of the Law, Mind, or Will of God, was then Revealed unto them. So that in this Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. 14. As Blessings are pronounced upon the Obedient upon *Condition* of their Obedience; so as great a Curse is pronounced upon the Disobedient. And as we have already said is therefore of the same tenor with the Three fore-mentioned Covenants, in *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Deuteronomy*. For did God tell our First Parent in the Garden of *Eden*,

Eden, concerning the Forbidden Fruit. *In the day that thou Eatest thereof thou shalt surely Die?* (and so in the rest) we have the like Threatning here. *He that is Uncircumcised, that Soul shall be Cut off from his People: He hath broken my Covenant.* And if that were a Covenant of Works, why not this?

§ 5. And therefore though 'tis true God promised to *Establish his Covenant betwixt himself and Abraham, and his Seed after him in their Generations, for an Everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto him, and to his Seed after him*, ver. 7, &c. Yet still, it was provided they kept his Covenant, and fulfilled the Condition thereof on their parts, *ver.* 9, 10. Else they were to be Cut off. And indeed the same Promises, for the Substance of them, were made unto the same People at Mount *Sinai*; and upon the same Condition, *Exod.* 19. 4, 5. *You have seen* (saith God there) *what I did unto the Ægyptians, and how I bear you on Eagles Wings, and brought you unto my self. Now therefore, if ye will Obey my Voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar Treasure unto me, above all People, for all the Earth is mine.* ve. 6. *And ye shall be unto me a Kingdom of Priests, and an Holy Nation.* And if this was a Covenant of Works, as the Apostle doth plainly Affirm it is, *Rom.* 10. 5. from *Lev.* 18. 5. Why not that made with *Abraham* also, since the terms are the same, as well as the Promises are the same? The like account the Scripture gives us of the Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 29. *You have seen* (saith Moses there) ver. 2, 3. *all that the Lord did before your Eyes in the Land of Egypt, unto Pharaoh, and all his Servants; the great Temptations which thine Eyes have seen, and those great Miracles*, ver. 4. *Yet the Lord hath not given you an Heart to perceive, and Eyes to see, and Ears to hear, unto this day.* ver. 5. 6. *And I have led you forty years in the Wilderness; your clothes are not waxen old upon you, —— That ye might know, that I am the Lord your God*, ver. 9. *Keep therefore the words of this Covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do.* The same Language with that *Exod*, 19. 5. and *Lev.* 18. 5. compared with *Rom.* 10. 5. So that we cannot but plainly see, that all those fore-mentioned Covenants, are of one and the same Nature; what the one is, the others are the same. And therefore if the Covenant made with our First *Parent* before the Fall, and that made with *Israel*, at Mount *Sinai*, were neither of them a Covenant of Grace, nor a Gospel Covenant; whereof Christ is the alone and only Mediator: For the same Reason, neither was that mentioned *Deut.* 29. nor that *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. as being all of the same tenor, and

and the Promiſes in them all of a like Nature.

§ 6. "The whole entire Nature, (ſaith Dr. *Owen*) of the "*Covenant of Works*, conſiſted in this; *That upon our Perſonal* "*Obedience, according unto the Law and Rule of it, we ſhould* "*be Accepted with God, and Rewarded with him.* Herein the "*Eſſence* of it did conſiſt. And what ever Covenant proceedeth "on theſe terms, or hath the Nature of them in it; however it "may be varied with Additions or Alterations, is the ſame "Covenant ſtill, and not another. As in the Renovation of the "*Promiſe*, wherein the *Eſſence of the Covenant of Grace* was "contained, God did oft times make other Additions unto it, as "unto *Abraham* and *David*; yet was it ſtill the *ſame Covenant*, "for the Subſtance of it, and not another: So whatever Variations "may be made in, or Additions unto the Diſpenſation of the *Firſt* "*Covenant*, ſo long as this Rule is retained, *Do this and Live*; "it is ſtill the ſame Covenant for the Subſtance and Eſſence of it. Dr. *Owen* in his late Diſcourſe Entituled, *The Doctrine of Juſtification, by Imputed Righteouſneſs.* p. 397.

SECT. II.

BUt forasmuch as Mr. *Roberts*, Mr. *Sedgwick* and many other Divines who have Written upon the Covenants, do affirm, that the Covenant at Mount *Sinai* was a Covenant of Faith; or, which is all one, a Covenant of Grace: At leaſt that it was *Subſerviently* the Covenant of Grace: Or a Covenant of Grace for the *Subſtance* of it, though propounded in a more dark way, and in a manner fitting for the State of that People, and that preſent time and Condition of the Church. And for as much as it will unavoidably follow that if that was a Covenant of Grace: So alſo was that made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. We ſhall therefore the more Intendly apply our ſelves toward the Diſcovery of their great Miſtakes in this Reſpect; it being of ſo vaſt an Importance to the Church of God, to be ſet at rights herein; on which (as all will grant) So much of the Superſtructure of the Chriſtian Faith and Practice depends. For this purpoſe therefore (Additional unto what hath been already ſaid) we ſhall only premiſe two Arguments, proving that the Covenant at Mount Sinai mentioned, *Exod.* 19. and *Exod* 20. was no other than a Covenant of Works. And then proceed to Anſwer thoſe Scripture Objections which are uſually urged by way of Oppoſition hereunto.

§. 2. In the firſt place then; that the Covenant at Mount Sinai before mentioned was no other than a Covenant of Works: We thus prove.

Firſt,

First, that Covenant that is not of Faith, cannot be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works: But the Apostle doth Expresly affirm, this *the Law is not of Faith*, *Gal.* 3. 11, 12. Which is most plainly to be understood of Mount *Sinai* Covenant; therefore that Covenant cannot be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works.

Secondly, that Covenant which is now Repealed, could not be a Covenant of Grace, but of Works. But the Apostle doth plainly Affirm, that the Covenant which God made with his People at Mount *Sinai*, *when he took them by the Hand to lead them out of the Land of Egypt for the faultiness thereof, is now Repealed*, *Heb.* 7. 18. *Chap.* 8. 7. 13. 2. *Cor.* 3. 7. 11. *Col.* 2. 14. Therefore it could not be a Covenant of Grace, but of Works. The Covenant of Grace being every way Immutable and perfect, and therefore unrepealable, and Eternal, 2. *Sam.* 23. 5. *Isa.* 55. 3. *Heb.* 7. 21, 22, 24, 25. *Heb* 13. 20. *And the Gifts and Callings thereof without Repentance*, Rom. 11. 27. 29. And if Mount *Sinai* Covenant, was no other than a Covenant of Works, and accordingly now Repealed: It cannnt be denied but that the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. Was of the same Nature, and therfeore also now Repealed, *Act.* 15. 10. 24. *Col.* 2. 14.

§. 3. If any shall Object that it is unlikely that the Covenant of Works should be Renewed after Mans fall, and after the Covenant of Grace had actually taken place, as it did, in the first promise Concerning the *Womans Seed*, that was to *bruise the Serpents Head*. We answer that how absurd so ever it may seem to us, it is plain matter of fact that so it was; and we ought not to Impeach Infinite Wisdome, that so appointed it. And if we will know the reason why the Covenant of Works should be thus Renewed after the Fall; the Scripture Expresly tells us: That *the Law was added because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made*, Gal. 3. 19. The Apostle had before told us, *ver.* 17. That *the Covenant that was Confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was* 430 *Years after, could not Disannul that it should make the Promise of none Effect, wherefore then* (faith he, *ver.* 19.) *Serveth the Law?* To which himself gives this Resolution: That *it was added because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made.* And elsewhere the same Apostle Informs us: That *the Law entered that the Offence might abound*, Rom. 5. 20. Or as he Expresseth it, Chap. 7. 13. *That Sin by the Commandment* might *become exceeding Sinful.* It being Evident that the Law was appointed as a *School-master to Christ*, Gal. 3. 24. For so it was to the Jews; that is, to shew them the Nature of Sin, and the Holines

Holineſs and Righteouſneſs of God; to convince them of their Sin and Miſery without Chriſt, and their neceſſity therefore of a Saviour, *Rom.* 7. 7, 12. 13. And for this purpoſe it ſtill ſerves to all Men in an unregenerate State *Rom.* 3. 19. But though the Law doth indeed ſhew us our Neceſſity of Chriſt, and our Miſery without him, yet it doth not *bring us to Chriſt* (as our Tranſlation hath it) for that is the Work of the Covenant of Faith only, *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8, 9. And that as it ſtands oppoſed unto the Legal Covenant, *ver.* 5, 6, *&c.*

§ 4. There is a double Enquiry made by the Apoſtle (ſaith Dr. *Owen*, on *Gal.* 3.) with reſpect unto the *Law*, or the Covenant of *Sinai*. [1.] *Unto what end in General is it ſerved?* [2.] *Whether it were not contrary to the Promiſe of God?* "Unto both theſe the Apoſtle anſwereth from the Nature, Office, "and Work of that Covenant. For there were two things in "it; Firſt a *Revival* and *Repreſentation* of the firſt Covenant of "Works, with its Sanction and Curſe. Secondly, A *Direction of* "*the Church* unto the Accompliſhment of the Promiſe. From "theſe two doth the Apoſtle frame his Anſwer unto the double "Enquiry laid down. And unto the firſt Enquiry, *Unto what* "*end it ſerved?* He Anſwers, *It was added becauſe of Tranſ-* "*greſſions.* The Promiſe being given, there ſeems to have been "no need of it: Why then was it added to it at that Seaſon? "*It was added becauſe of Tranſgreſſions.* The fulneſs of time "was not yet come wherein the Promiſe was to be Fulfilled, "Accompliſhed, and Eſtabliſhed, as the only Covenant wherein "the Church was to Walk with God, or the *Seed* was not yet "come; as the Apoſtle here ſpeaks to whom the Promiſe was "made. In the *mean time*, ſome Order muſt be taken about "*Sin and Tranſgreſſion*, that all the Order of things appointed "of God, were not Overthrown by them. And this was done "two ways by the Law. [1.] By Reviving the Commands of "the *Covenant of Works*, with the Sanction of Death, it put an "Awe on the minds of Men, and ſet Bounds unto their Luſts, "that they ſhould not dare to run forth into that Exceſs which "they were Naturally inclined unto. It was therefore *added* "*becauſe of Tranſgreſſions*, that in the Declaration of God's Seve-"rity againſt them, ſome Bounds might be fixed unto them: *For* "*the knowledge of Sin is by the Law.* [2.] *To ſhut up Unbe-*"*lievers*, and ſuch as would not ſeek for Righteouſneſs, Life, "and Salvation by the Promiſe, under the Power of the Cove-"nant of Works, and Curſe attending it. *It concluded, or ſhut* "*up all under Sin*, ſaith the Apoſtle, ver. 22. This was the end

of

"of the Law for this end was it Added, as it gave a Reviveal "unto the Covenant of Works. Dr. *Owen's* Exposition on the, *Hebrews*. 3*d*. Vol. p. 231.

§ 5. It is true, that Scripture, *Gal*. 3. 24. where the Apostle tells us that *the Law was our School-Master to Christ, that we might be Justified by Faith*, is strongly urged by some, to prove that the *Law* must needs be therefore a *Covenant of Faith*. But it is Evident, that the School mastership of the Law, and the Covenant of Faith are two quite different things; as appears by the Words before and after. *ver*. 23. *Before Faith came* saith he, *we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the Faith which should afterward be Revealed*. ver. 24. *Wherefore the Law was our School-master to Christ, that we might be justified by Faith*. ver. 25. *But after that Faith is come, we are no longer under a School-master*. So that the Schol mastership of the Law is one thing, and the Covenant of Faith another: For when the one cometh, the other ceaseth. When the one takes place the other vanisheth. The Law therefore could not be a Covenant of Faith, it being here so plainly Opposed or Contra-distinguished thereunto. Accordingly the Apostle elsewhere assures us, that *the Law Written and Engraven in Stones was a Ministration of Death and Condemnation*, 2. *Cor*. 3. 6. 7. 9. And consequently gave no hopes of Relief to the Miserable Sinner as the Covenant of Faith doth. It convinc'd him indeed of the dreadful Nature of Sin; and of the Infinite Purity and Holiness of Gods Nature and Being, against whom it had Sinned; but it left no Room for Repentance. For *Cursed is every one* (saith the Law) *that Continueth not in all things which are Written in the Book of the Law to do them*. Therefore it is calld *the Hand-writing of Ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us; which Christ took out of the way, nailing it to his Cross*, Col. 2. 14. So that the Law could not possibly be a Covenant of Faith: It being constantly represented to us in the Scripture, as being of a vastly different Nature therefrom, and that in the very *Essence* or *Substance* thereof. The one being a *Ministration of Death and Condemnation*, the other a *Ministration of Life and Peace*.

SECT. III.

SECT. III.

WE are told indeed by Mr. *Obadiah Segdwick*, in his Discourse upon the Covenant of Grace, p. 175. "That the "Covenant made with the People of *Israel* at *Mount Sinai*, was "at least subserviently the Covenant of Grace; a Covenant of "Grace for the Substance of it, though propounded in a more "dark way, and in a manner, fitting for the State of that People, "and that present time and condition of the Church.

§. 2. But this is but an Evasion, and serves for no other purpose than to darken the Truth: For the thing is plain, that the Law was as much a Covenant of Works, as that made with our First Parent. "The Jewish Legal Covenant (saith Dr. *Annesly* in his "Sermon upon the Covenant of Grace; *Morning Exercise*, p. 122) "Neither admitted of Faith in the Redeemer, nor Repentance of "Sin: For Pardon of sin and Curse for Sin are Inconsistent. *Gal.* "3. 10. *As many as are of the Works of the Law are under the* "*Curse*: For it is Written, *Cursed is every one that continueth* "*not in all things which are Written in the Book of the Law* "*to do them.* As many as depend upon the Works of the Law "for Justification, are under the Curse. And the Law (saith he) "discovered no other way of Justification, but by Works. Mr. *Cooper* also in the same *Morning Exercise*, p. 117. tells us, "That "*Moses* his Law is opposed to the Covenant of Grace, as another "Covenant, upon this very distinguishing account of Obedience "and Faith, Works and Grace; as you may see (saith he) at large "among other Places, *Heb.* 8. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, &c.

§. 3. The Law therefore was not so much as *Subserviently* a Covenant of Faith, much less for the *Substance* of it so; for it is quite another thing, and is constantly so represented unto us in the Scriptures. The Apostle saith indeed, *The Law was our Schoolmaster to Christ* εἰς Χριστὸν He doth not say *to bring us* to Christ, as our Translation hath it: (For as we have already said, that is the Work of the Covenant of Faith only.) And therefore that Notion, that the Law was *Subserviently* a Covenant of Faith hath no Foundation: Those Words [*to bring us*] being unduly added to the Original Text, and are accordingly put in a Different Character in our Translation thereof. But, (saith the Apostle in the words immediately following) *After that Faith is come, we are no longer under*

under a School-master. But how can that be if the Law was a Covenant of Faith? Must the Covenant of Faith cease; at least in this World? Must the Covenant of Faith *Vanish*, be *Blotted out*; *taken out of the way*, and *done away*, as the Apostle speaks of the *Law*? Or was the Covenant of Faith *against us, and contrary to us*, as he speaks of *the Hand-writing of Ordinances*, that is now *Blotted out*. And indeed therefore, neither could the Law be so much as *Subserviently* a Covenant of Faith: For if it had, the Apostle would never have described it as hath been now declared.

§ 4. And 'tis in vain to say, "That *the Law was a Covenant of* "*Faith, though propounded in a more dark way, and in a manner,* "*fitting for the State of that People, and that present Time* "*and Condition of the Church*, (as Mr. *Sedgwick* speaks.) For the Apostle Expresly affirms, that *the Law is not of Faith*: (It is not of Faith Absolutely, not Comparatively) *but the man that doth them, shall live in them*, Gal. 3. 12. The Law therefore was no other than a Covenant of Works, since not only the Apostle doth here assure us, that it is not of Faith, but also the same Rule, *Do this and Live*, is that still retained therein as at first. And it is therefore different from the Covenant of Faith; not barely in respect of the *Degrees* or clearness of the Revelation of Gospel-Grace, (as is commonly Suggested:) For the Law, as hath been already proved, discovers none at all, but leaves the guilty Sinner wholly Remediless, without the least glimpse of Light or Comfort. The Law therefore differs from the Covenant of Faith *Specifically*, in respect of the whole *Nature* or *Essence* of it. In which respect the Law could never be appointed as a School-master *to bring us* to Christ. Well it may convince us of our *Necessity* of him; but bring us to him it cannot.

§ 5. So that then these are the Reasons which the *Holy Spirit* himself Suggesteth, why the Law was added? Or why the Covenant of Works was Revived after Man's Fall, and even after the Proclaiming of the first Promise concerning the Womans Seed, *Gen.* 3. 15. which was renewed to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 22. 18. *It was added*, (saith the Apostle) *because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made.* And *it entered that the Offence might abound.* It being appointed as a School-master to Christ, to convince the Jews of their necessity of a Saviour. And since it cannot be denied, but that all the Sons and Daughters of *Adam* must of Necessity be under one or another of the two Covenants; either that of Works, or that of Grace; And since *all Men by Nature are Children of Wrath*, Eph. 2, 3. And since it would be utterly absurd to affirm, that such are under a Covenant of Grace till Converted: It of necessity follows, that unto such the

Covenant of Works is ſtill in force, and under it they are ſtill wrought upon by the Grace of the Goſpel; the Law abating nothing, but ſtill exacting the *utmoſt Farthing*. Neither from the Impoſſibility of Man's yielding that perfect Obedience which that Covenant requires; can we juſtly conclude that therefore it is not ſtill in Force: For *God hath not forfeited or loſt his Right of Dominion, though we have loſt our Strength or Capacity of Obedience*. So that it is evident, that the Law given upon Mount *Sinai* to the People in the Wilderneſs; or the Law written in Stones, (which was a plain and clear Manifeſtation of the Law written in the Heart of Man at the firſt) was no other than a Covenant of Works. Thus it was to the *Jews*, and thus it ſtill continues in its full Power, Force and Virtue to all Men in an Unregenerate State. *For what things ſoever the Law ſaith, it ſaith to them that are under the Law, that every Mouth may be ſtopped, and all the World may become Guilty before God*, Rom. 3. 19.

SECT. IV.

NEither was the Law by the *Jews* only Interpreted as a *Covenant of Works*, but as it is evident by *Moſes* himſelf, and by *Paul* alſo. We are told indeed by Mr. *Sedgwick* in his fore-mentioned Diſcourſe upon the Covenants, p. 173. "That we muſt diſtinguiſh between the intention of God in giving the Law, and the "Abuſe or Perverting of the Law. We grant (ſaith he) that many "of the *Jews* did ſet up a Legal Righteouſneſs for their Juſtifications, and reſted upon the Works of the Law, as if Life came by "them; againſt which *Paul* doth notably Argue in his Epiſtles to "the *Romans* and *Galatians*. But this, ſaith he, was not the intention of God in the Sanction of Law. They could never find a "juſtifying Righteouſneſs by the Law, or Works of the Law, "under the Notion of a Covenant of Works; nor did God ever "propound it for that end.

§ 2. For Anſwer hereunto we ſay; That ſince, by Mr. *Sedgwicks* own confeſſion, the *Jews* could never find a Juſtifying Righteouſneſs by the Law, or by the Works of it. From hence it inevitably follows, that it could not be a Covenant of Faith. Sure it is that the Covenant of Faith *Juſtifies* all that are under it: For *being Juſtified by Faith, we have Peace with God*, &c. *Rom.* 5. 1. That Covenant therefore that could never Juſtifie any that were under it, could never be a Covenant of Faith: But the *Scripture* is Expreſs, that by *the deeds of the Law there ſhall no Fleſh be Juſtified in God's ſight*, Rom. 3. 20. Therefore that Covenant could never be a Covenant of Faith. And yet again, that Covenant under which

which though many were Justified; yet none were ever *Justified by it*, or *by virtue of it*, could never be a Covenant of Faith: But such was the nature of the Law, that though many were Justified *under it*, yet none were ever Justified *by it*, or *by virtue of it*, Rom. 3. 20. Therefore that Covenant could never be a Covenant of Faith. And if the Law was not a Covenant of Faith, then, it must of necessity follow, that it could be no other than a Covenant of Works. And indeed so it was appointed and declared by God himself, *Lev.* 18. 5. *Ye shall therefore keep my Statutes and Judgments; which if a man do, he shall live in them.* And this the Spirit of God by the Apostle *Paul* takes special notice of, *Rom.* 10. 5. *For Moses* (saith he) *describeth the Righteousness which is of the Law, That the man that doth these things shall live by them.* And what can be a more plain Description of a Covenant of Works, and that of God's own Designation and Appointment? And that not in the way of a Partial imperfect Obedience: But *as it is Written; Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them*, Gal. 3. 10 which the Apostle quotes from *Deut.* 27. 26. *Cursed be he that Confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them. And all the People shall say* Amen.

§ 3. So that the *Jews* were *right enough* in their Notion concerning the Law, in reference to the *true Nature* thereof, that it was indeed a Covenant of Works, (For *Paul* doth plainly acknowledge it to be such, and God himself by the Mouth of his Servant *Moses* as plainly expresseth it so to be, in the very first Sanction of it) though they were out in respect of its proper *use and intention*; which was not that any should attain unto Life and Righteousness thereby: but as we have before observed, to shew them the Nature of Sin, and the Holiness and Righteousness of God; to convince them of their Sin and Misery without *Christ*, and their necessity therefore of a Saviour; which they being ignorant of, and still going about to Establish their own Righteousness, which was of the Law; and refusing to submit themselves unto the Righteousness of God, (which was now Manifested without the Law, as it had been before Witnessed by the Law and the Prophets) They Stumbled at that Stumbling-stone, and were accordingly Broken and Snared and Taken, *Rom.* 9. 31, 32, 33. Chap. 10. 3. And this was the true ground of the Dispute between the Apostle and them.

§ 4. But all this notwithstanding; it is evident that the Law was a Covenant of Works still. And it is also as evident, that it was Appointed and Established by God as a distinct Covenant from the Promise of Grace, and essentially different therefrom; under which the Natural Posterity of *Abraham* were for a Season to be Subject-

ed, until *the time appointed of the Father*, Gal. 4. 1, 2, &c. as the Fruit of infinite Wisdom, who thought fit to impose this Burthen upon them, notwithstanding, or rather *Additional* unto those Discoveries of Grace: (For the Law is said to have been *Added unto the Promise*) that had been otherwise Revealed unto them, and whereby they were Saved. So that the forementioned Objection notwithstanding, it still remains Firm and Unshaken, that the Law was no other than a Covenant of Works: So it was designed and appointed by God himself; and constantly in the Scripture is it Represented to us under that Character.

SECT. V.

But whereas the Apostle tells us, that *the Law is not against the Promises*, Gal. 3. 21. Mr. *Sedgwick* will needs hence conclude, that the Law was not a Covenant of Works: "For (saith "he) *The Law is not against the Promises*, nor doth *Faith make* "*void the Law*. Both these can very well agree together; but "so they could not if the Law had been given as a Covenant of "Works: For now the Law would be Expresly against the Pro"mises, and Faith will certainly make void the Law. The Pro"mises of God are contrary to a Covenant of Works, and Faith is "Destructive to a Covenant of Works. If therefore the Promises "and Faith, and the Law can consist, then the Law cannot be set up "as a Covenant of Works."

§. 2. To this we Reply; First, That it ought to be duly Observed, that the Law and the Promise having *divers ends*, it doth not therefore follow that there is an Inconsistency between them: For although there is nothing that can be clearer than this, That the Law was set up and appointed by God, as a Covenant of Works to the *Jews*, to convince them of Sin, and the necessity of a Saviour; yet did God never intend it as a Means to *give Life and Righteousness*: nor was it able so to do. The *end* of the *Promise* was to give Life, Righteousness, Justification and Salvation; all by *Christ*; to whom, and concerning whom it was made. But this was not the end for which the Covenant of Works was Revived, in the Covenant of *Sinai*. For although in its self it requires a perfect Righteousness, and gives a promise of Life thereon, *He that doth these things, shall live in them*; yet it could *give* neither Righteousness nor Life to any in a State of Sin, *Rom.* 8. 3. Chap. 10. 4. Wherefore the Promise and the Law having *divers ends*, they are not *contrary* to one another. Nay, rather the Law even as it is a Covenant of Works, instead of being *against* the Promise, it tends to the *Establishment* of it, by declaring the *Impossibility of obtaining*

ing Reconciliation and Peace with God, any other way, but *by the Promise*: For representing the Commands of the Covenant of Works, requiring perfect Sin-less Obedience, under the Penalty of the Curse; it convinced Men, that this was no way for Sinners to seek for Life and Salvation by. And herewith it so urged the Consciences of Men, that they could have no Rest nor Peace in themselves, but what the Promise would afford them; whereunto therefore they saw a necessity of betaking themselves. So that though we affirm the Law to be no other than a Covenant of Works, as the Apostle himself doth; yet it doth not therefore follow that it is against the Promise, it having so Blessed a Subserviency toward the Establishment thereof.

§ 3. Secondly, though the Apostle doth indeed tell us, *Gal.* 3. 21. That *the Law is not against the Promises*. The following Words do sufficiently clear his Meaning to be of quite another Nature than Mr *Sedgwick* in his forementioned Discourse, apprehends it to be. Mr. *Sedgwick* indeed will by no-means allow that the Law was set up as a *Covenant of Works*; and then it must of neeessity follow, that it is a *Covenant of Faith*. But the Apostle seems to be of another mind: For having told us, *ver.* 18. That *if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise*: *But God gave it to* Abraham *by Promise*. And having answered the Question, or Objection, *ver.* 19. *Wherefore then serveth the Law?* To which himself gives this Resolution, That *it was added because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made*. He brings in this further Objection, *ver.* 21. against what he had before Asserted, *viz.* That *if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise*, &c. *Is the Law then against the Promises? God forbid*, (saith he.) *For if there had been a Law given which could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law*: *But the Scripture hath concluded all under Sin, that the Promise by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe*. In the first place then it is Evident and Undeniable, that *Abraham's* Inheritance was not derived unto him through the Law: For, (saith our Apostle) *If the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise*; *but God gave it to* Abraham *by Promise*. So that it clearly appears by the scope of the Apostle's Argument, that the Law could not be a Covenant of Faith: For if it had, it would have been honoured as an Instrument for the conveyance of *Abraham's* Inheritance: But, saith he, God gave it to *Abraham* by Promise, not by the Law; therefore the Law could not be a Covenant of Faith. But *is the Law then against the Promises? God forbid*, (saith he.) *For if there had been a Law given, which could have given Life, verily*

Righteousness should have been by the Law; but the Scripture hath concluded all under Sin, that the Promise of Faith by Jesus Christ might be given to them that Believe. So that the Law could not be a Covenant of Faith, since the Apostle doth here so plainly distinguish between them; setting forth the Weakness of the one, and the Strength and Perfection of the other. The Law (saith he) *Could not give Life; but the Covenant of Faith doth.* The Law indeed would, but could not: It promiseth Life, but it could not perform it through the Weakness of the Flesh. (So there is no Repugnancy in the Law against the Promises) but what the Law could not do, the Covenant of Faith performeth: For it not only promiseth Life, but accomplisheth what it hath promised, and sets the Soul in Safety.

§ 4. According to the plain and clear Scope of the Apostle's Reasoning, therefore; the Law is so far from being a Covenant of Faith, that it is quite another thing. For if it had been a Covenant of Faith, it would have given Life, as the Covenant of Faith doth: But it could not give Life, therefore it could be no other than a Covenant of Works. But *is the Law then against the Promises? God forbid,* saith *Paul*; and so say we. For supposing the Law to be, as it is indeed, a pure Covenant of Works; yet through the Satisfaction of Christ, there is no Repugnancy, or Hostile Contrariety betwixt the Law and the Promises, or between the Law and Faith, which hath respect to the Promises. There is only a difference of Deficiency, in respect of that Strength that there is in the one, to what there was in the other. The one being Weak through the Flesh; the other Strong and Powerful, and goes through-stitch with its Work. But what the Law could not do through our Weakness, that Christ hath performed, by fulfilling its Commands, and submitting to its Curse, on our behalf; whereby God's Justice is satisfied, and Everlasting Righteousness obtained, for the Salvation of Sinners. And indeed herein consisteth the Covenant of Faith; here is the Object of it, and in this path is the very *Law* and *Justice* of God it self most highly Glorified. Shall we say then, that because the Law is a Covenant of Works, that it is therefore *against the Promises? God forbid.* For *who shall lay any thing to the Charge of God's Elect,* so as to hinder the accomplishment of the Promises upon them? The Law it self doth not, cannot Impeach them, since *it is God that Justifieth.* Or, *Who shall Condemn* them? The Law it self cannot; since *it is Christ that Died.* It is true, the Law saith, That *the man that doth these things, shall Live by them.* And indeed herein the very Essence of the Covenant of Works consisteth. But the Covenant of Faith leads us to what *Christ* hath done and performed for us; which

which the Covenant of Works doth not. But though the Law leads us not to *Christ*; yet *Christ being made under it*, and giving it its due honour on our behalf; hence it follows, that the Law it self that was before our Enemy, ſtands up as our Friend: Even that Law that was before *againſt us*, which was *Contrary to us*, and which was in it ſelf no other than *the Miniſtration of Death and Condemnation*; even that Law ſtands up as our Friend, through the Mediation of *Chriſt*, *whom God* therefore *hath ſet forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood to declare his Righteouſneſs that he might be Juſt, and the Juſtifier of him that Believeth in Jeſus*, Rom. 3. 24, 25, 26. So that the Law (through the Satisfaction of *Chriſt*; though it be, as it is indeed, a Covenant of Works; yet) is not *againſt the Promiſes*; there is no *Real Repugnancy*, or *Contrariety* between them, whatever there ſeems to be: Which made the Apoſtle Propound the Queſtion as he doth.

§ 5. Beſides, the ſame Apoſtle that tells us, *The Law is not againſt the Promiſes*, doth alſo expreſly Aſſure us, *That the Law is not of Faith, but the Man that doth them ſhall live by them*, Gal. 3, 12. So that though it is true, the Law is not againſt the Promiſes, *Since Mercy and Truth, Righteouſneſs and Peace are met together in Chriſt*; yet it is as true, that *the Law is not of Faith*. And if the Law is not of Faith; then neither can it be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works; as the ſame Apoſtle doth plainly affirm it is, *Rom.* 3. 27, 28. And therefore neither could it give Life: For if it could, Righteouſneſs ſhould have been by it: But (ſaith he) *The Scripture hath concluded all under Sin, that the Promiſe by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt might be given to them that Believe*. The Law therefore was not a Covenant of Faith: For if it had, it would have given Life, and ſo Righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the Law: But it could not give Life, and ſo Righteouſneſs was not by the Law, therefore it was not a Covenant of Faith. The like Inference may be clearly drawn from *Rom.* 10. 5, 6, &c. *Moſes* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *Deſcribeth the Righteouſneſs of the Law, that the Man which doth theſe things ſhall live by them. But the Righteouſneſs which is of Faith*, (or Goſpel Covenant) ſpeaketh on this wiſe, *&c. If thou Believeſt, thou ſhalt be Saved*. Wherein we cannot but obſerve, that the Apoſtle maketh a plain difference betwixt the Righteouſneſs of the Law, and the Righteouſneſs of Faith. The one, ſaith he, ſpeaketh after this ſort; the other ſpeaketh after quite another rate. From whence alſo it plainly follows, that the Law could not be a Covenant of Faith; ſince the Righteouſneſs of the one is here ſo plainly Oppoſed to the Righteouſneſs of the other; which yet it would not be, had the Law been a Covenant of Faith; nay, though it had been ſo only more

Darkly, and not with that clearness of Demonstration as the Gospel Reveals it; had it been so *Subserviently* only; much more if it had been such for the Substance of it, as is Affirmed. For it cannot be imagined, that if it had been a Covenant of Grace, or a Covenant of Faith *Subserviently*, much more if it had been such for the *Substance* of it; that ever it would have been set in point blank *Opposition* to it, as quite *another thing*, as it is. When the Apostle tells us therefore, that the Righteousness which is of the Law saith, *Do this, and Live*; but the Righteousness of Faith speaketh in quite another *Dialect*: It is plain there is a difference between them *toto Genere*; or in the whole *Kind*, or *Substance* thereof, and not barely in the several *Degrees of Manifestation*; as is suggested: For as the Apostle Reasoneth concerning Election, *Rom.* 11. 6. So it is here. *If it be of Works, then it is no more Grace; otherwise Work is no more Work. And if by Grace, then it is no more of Works; otherwise Grace is no more Grace.* Either therefore the Law was a Covenant of Grace, or it was a Covenant of Works: If it was a Covenant of Grace, then according to the scope of the Apostle's Reasoning, it was not a Covenant of Works; or *it is no more of Works*; that is, it is not of Works at all: And consequently *Moses* doth not describe the Righteousness which is of the Law as he doth, *that the Man that doth these things, shall live by them.* But if this be absurd, and it be evident that it is, as it is indeed, a Covenant of Works: For the same Reason therefore neither can it in any Sence, be a Covenant of Gospel-Grace; otherwise (as the Apostle speaks) *Work is no more Work.* For these two, Grace and Works, or Faith and Works, are constantly in the Scripture opposed the one unto the other, in point of our Justification before God's Presence, (which is our present case) and admit of no Mixture.

§. 6. So that though the Law (even as it is a Covenant of Works) is not *against the Promises*; that is, there is no Repugnancy between them; there being a sweet Harmony and Conjunction of all the Blessed Attributes of God in Christ in the way of the Salvation of Sinners; yet the Law is constantly in the Scripture represented in a way of *Contradistinction* to the Promises; and so it is in the words foregoing, as hath been already observed, *ver.* 18. *If* (saith the Apostle) *the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise; but God gave it to* Abraham *by Promise.* And (which is yet clearer) the same Apostle doth also assure us, *Rom.* 4. 14. That *if they which are of the Law be heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none Effect.* Therefore the Law could not possibly be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works.

SECT. VI.

SECT. VI.

AND whereas the Apostle doth also tell us, *Rom.* 3. 31. *That we do not make Void the Law through Faith, but Establish it.* This also is true, and no way Contradicteth, but is Consistent enough with what hath been Asserted, *viz.* That the *Law* is no other than a Covenant of Works: Forasmuch as Christ our Surety hath fulfilled it for us, given it its due Honour, and satisfied its Penalty on our behalf. So that we are so far from making void the *Law*, through Faith; that it is rather thereby Established; as having received greater Honour by the obedience and Sufferings of Christ, than ever could have been given it by us.

§. 2. And yet further, (which is also Objected to the same purpose as before) whereas the Apostle doth also tell us, *Rom.* 10. 4. That *Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth.* The Sence is Evident: Forasmuch as *what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the Flesh; God sending his own Son in the likeness of Sinful Flesh, and for Sin* (or by a Sacrifice for Sin) *Condemned Sin in the Flesh, that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us* (that is in the Person of our Surety for us) *Rom.* 8, 3, 4. And thus *Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth*, by fulfilling its Commands, and answering its Penalty on our behalf. But doth it therefore follow that the *Law* is a Covenant of Faith? It is Evident that Christ Submitted to it as a Covenant of Works. And if it was so to Christ, it was so to us, and would have been so, and the Curse thereof had accordingly lighted on us, had not Christ Interposed for our Relief. *But*, (saith the Apostle) *when the Fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a Woman, made under the Law, to Redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons*, Gal. 4. 4, 5. From whence it clearly appears, that the Law was not a Covenant of Faith: For if it had, what necessity was there for *Christ* to have Redeemed us from under it? Can we imagine that *Christ* ever shed his Blood to Redeem us from being under a Covenant of Faith, or from being under a Gospel Covenant? The Law was therefore no other than a Covenant of Works, from which *Christ* hath now Redeemed us, by his Blood and Sufferings for us. The Law indeed shews us our Sin and Misery without *Christ*, but Relieves us not, *Rom.* 7. 7, 8, 9, 10. which the Covenant of Faith doth, *Rom.* 10. 6, 7, 8, 9. Nay the Law, instead of Relieving or Curing us, it brings us under the Curse, which the Covenant of Faith delivers us from, *Gal.* 3. 8, 9, 10. But though we are delivered from the Law as a

Covenant

Covenant of Life, *Do this, and live*; yet it is also as true, that All true Believers are still *under the Law to Christ*, as a *Rule of Life*, 1 Cor. 9. 21.

SECT. VII.

MR. *Sedgwick* doth indeed also tell us in his forementioned Discourse upon the Covenants, p. 174. "That that Covenant which God made with *Moses*, and under which *Moses* stood, "was no Covenant of Works: But *Moses* and the People of *Israel* "were both under the same Covenant. *Exod.* 34. 27. *I have made* "*a Covenant with thee and with Israel.* If any doubt under what "Covenant *Moses* stood, (whether of Works or Grace) let him "peruse *Heb.* 11. 26. What a Description he shall there find of "*Moses*. He shall there find him to be a Choice and Eminent Be-"liever in Christ; *Esteeming the Reproach of Christ greater Riches* "*than the Treasures in Ægypt, and having respect to the Recom-*"*pence of Reward*, &c. Now, certainly such a Choice Believer in "Christ, was not under a Covenant of Works. And p. 175, 176. "speaking of the immediate Introduction unto the giving of the "Law, *Exod.* 20. 2. *I am the Lord thy God, which have brought* "*thee out of the Land of Ægypt.* Why (saith he) there is the ve-"ry Covenant of Grace. Here is God as our God; (And *Blessed* "*are the People who have the Lord to be their God.*) And here is "Jesus Christ the Mediator of the Covenant implied; for in Christ "doth God become our God. And there is our Redemption from "Sin and *Satan*, intimated, by their Deliverance out of *Ægypt*. "And presently there is the Worship of God Instituted and Ap-"pointed, which if Acceptable to God must be performed with "Faith: *For without Faith it is impossible to please God.* And "(saith he) upon the Breaking of the Tables of the Covenant, be-"fore they were Written again, there is such a Preface made by "God, as can no way fit any Covenant but that of Grace, as you "may see in *Exod.* 34. 7. *The Lord, the Lord, Gracious and Mer-*"*ciful, Long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping* "*mercy for thousands, forgiving Iniquities, Transgressions and Sin.*

§ 2. To this we Reply, that it is indeed most certain and undeniable, that both *Moses* and all the Elect among that People of Old, were under the same Covenant of Grace with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and all the rest of the Holy Patriarchs before; and by that they were Saved; and without it there had been no Salvation for them. And accordingly we are told, *Exod.* 33. That upon *Moses* his earnest request unto God, that he might *see his Glory*; and that he would afford unto him his Gracious *Presence*, for the more comfortable Conduct of that great and mighty People through that vast and

howling

howling Wilderneſs: The Lord is pleaſed *ver.* 17. to Promiſe, that he would *do this thing* that *Moſes* had ſpoken: *For* (ſaith he) *thou haſt found grace in my ſight, and I know thee by name, And he ſaid, I will make all my goodneſs paſs before thee; and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee, and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious; and will ſhew Mercy to whom I will ſhew Mercy.* And accordingly, Chap. 34. 5, 6, 7. *The Lord deſcended in the Cloud, and ſtood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord paſſed by before him, and Proclaimed, the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and Gracious, Long-ſuffering, and abundant in goodneſs and truth; keeping mercy for thouſands; forgiving iniquity, tranſgreſſion and ſin.* Which was abſolutely and undeniably a Covenant of Grace, which God then made and confirmed unto *Moſes* by Name, and unto all that were *Elected* among that People; (for it was not to *all*, ſince God expreſly tells *Moſes*, that *he would be gracious to whom he would be gracious, and would ſhew mercy to whom he would ſhew mercy.*) And accordingly this was that that God's People then lived upon, and were ſaved by: For if there had been no other Covenant made with them than that that was contained in the two Tables of Stone, it had been utterly impoſſible that either *Moſes* or any of the reſt could ever have been Saved. And this Goſpel Cordial ſeems to have been purpoſely afforded unto *Moſes* and the reſt of the Faithful with him, for the Relief of their ſinking Spirits under the dread and terror of that *Fiery Burning Law*, Deut. 33, 2. *The Lord came from Sinai, and roſe up from Seir unto them; he ſhined forth from Mount* Paran; *and he came with ten thouſands of Saints: From his right-hand went a Fiery Law*, that had been before proclaimed by the Mouth of God himſelf, and had been alſo written with God's own Finger; and was now about to be renewed upon the breaking of the firſt Tables of Stone. Which diſcovery of Gods Infinite *Holineſs, Juſtice and Righteouſneſs*, proclaimed with ſo much Majeſty and Glory, attended with ſuch Thunderings, Blackneſs, Darkneſs and Tempeſt, was ſo dreadful and terrible, that *Moſes* himſelf exceedingly fears, and quakes at the Sight and Hearing thereof: And is accordingly taken Notice of and repreſented by the Apoſtle as a Diſcriminating, or Diſtinguiſhing Character between that and the Goſpel Covenant, *Heb.* 12. 18. &c. *You are not come* (ſaith he) *to the Mount that might be touched, and that Burned with Fire, nor unto Blackneſs, and Darkneſs, and Tempeſt, and the ſound of a Trumpet, and the voice of Words; which Voice they that heard, intreated that the Word ſhould not be ſpoken to them any more. And ſo terrible was the Sight, that* Moſes *himſelf ſaid, I exceedingly fear and quake. But ye are come unto Mount Sion, to the City of the Living God, to the Heavenly Jeruſalem, to God the Judge of all; to Jeſus*

the

the Mediator of the New Covenant, &c. From whence it is evident that there is an *Essential* difference between these two, the Law and the Gospel; so as that what the one is, the other is not; the Law is not the Gospel, nor the Gospel the Law. You are not come (saith he) unto the Legal, but unto the Gospel Covenant. The Legal Covenant discover'd nothing but Blackness, and Darkness and Tempest, and a *voice of Words that could not be endured*: For according to the Apostle's own present Description or Character thereof, it made no discovery of the least glimps of Gospel-Grace at all. The Legal Covenant therefore could not be a Covenant of Grace, or a Covenant of Faith, that made no discovery of any such thing, but rather the contrary; so as that it makes *Moses* himself exceedingly Quake and Tremble.

§. 3. However, it is certain that both *Moses*, and all the Elect among that People of Old, were under the Covenant of Grace, as we have already said, and by that were saved: And accordingly we are told, that *they did all* (that is, all the Elect among them) *Eat the same spiritual Meat, and did all Drink the same spiritual Drink: For they Drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.* 1 Cor. 10. 3. 4. And it is as Evident that it was no other than *Christ himself* that was the *Angel of Gods presence*, that was to go before them and Conduct them in the way they were to go. But yet all this notwithstanding, it is plain that the Law was a Covenant of Works still; and it is also as Evident that it was a *distinct* Covenant, and *Essentially different* from the Covenant of Grace: And was accordingly made with *Moses*, and the *whole Body of the Congregation*, and not with *Moses* and those that were *Elected* among them only; as the Covenant of Grace was. And therefore Exod. 19. 5, 6. (Saith God, there to the whole Body of the Congregation of *Israel*, at the foot of Mount Sinai. *Now therefore if ye will Obey my voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, then ye shall be a Peculiar Treasure unto me above all People: for all the Earth is mine: And ye shall be to me a Kingdom of Priests, and a Holy Nation. These are the Words that thou shalt speak unto the Children of Israel.* Mark it: These are the words that thou shalt speak unto *the Children of Israel*, that is, unto the whole Body of that People, without Exception of any, as being of Universal Concernment unto them all. And *these are the Words*, that is, these are the *Terms* on which thou shalt propound these my Promises to them, *viz. If you will Obey my Voice indeed, and keep my Covenant with all your Heart, and with all your Soul*; so as not in the least to vary, or step aside from what I have now Commanded you; then I will do thus and thus, unto, and for you, and I will give you a Convincing Discovery, that I am indeed the *Lord your God, which*

have

have brought you out of the Land of Egypt. Forupon these and no other terms do I now enter into Covenant with you. And *Cursed shall he be that Confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them:* The promises I now make you, are *full* and *Glorious* enough: But these are the *Terms* on which you must Expect if ever you come to the Fruition of them. This is the Subſtance of the Preface, and after Explication, that God himſelf makes, unto, and concerning the Covenant which he now made with *Moſes*, and with *Iſrael*, even with the whole Body of that People; which was by the Finger of God himſelf Written and Ingraven in Stones: And is accordingly mentioned at large, *Exod.* 20. In the ſeveral ten Branches, Commandments, or main Heads thereof.

§ 4 In the next place, if we Enquire into the *Nature* of this Covenant: What ſort of Covenant it was? Whether a Covenant of Grace, or a Covenant of Works: As it is Evident that it could be no other than a Covenant of Works; ſince we ſee it required perfect Obedience as the condition of obtaining the mercies therein promis'd; wherein the very Eſſence of that Covenant Conſiſted: So in order to a further diſcovery of the true nature of the Covenant in queſtion, We muſt compare ſome paſſages in Exod. 34. with 2 Cor. 3. and Col. 2. 14. In Exod. 34. 1. *The Lord ſaid unto Moſes, hew thee two Tables of Stone like unto the firſt: And I will Write upon theſe Tables the words that were in the firſt Tables,* ver. 4. *And he hewed two Tables of Stone like unto the firſt: And Moſes went up unto the Mount Sinai, as the Lord Commanded him, and took in his hand the two Tables of Stone.* ver. 28. *And he was there with the Lord 40 days and 40 nights; and he Wrote upon the Tables, the words of the Covenant, the ten Commandments. And it came to paſs, when Moſes came down from Mount Sinai (with the two Tables of Teſtimony in Moſes's hand, when he came down from the Mount) that Moſes Wiſt not that the Skin of his Face ſhone, while he talked with him. And when* Aaron *and all the Children of Iſrael ſaw* Moſes, *behold the Skin of his Face ſhone; and they were afraid to come nigh him.* If we will know therefore the true Nature of the Covenant, we ſhall find that the Spirit of God by the Apoſtle, doth give us a clear determination thereof in the fore-mentioned, 2. *Cor.* 3. 5, 6. *Our Sufficiency* (ſaith he) *is of God, who hath alſo made us able Miniſters of the New Teſtament; not of the Letter, but of the Spirit;* (that is, not of the Law, but of the Goſpel) *For the Letter Killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life. But* (ſaith he, ver. 7.) *If the Miniſtration of Death Written and Engraven in Stones was Glorious, ſo that the Children of Iſrael could not ſtedfaſtly behold the Face of Moſes for the Glory of his Countenance, which Glory was to be done away; how ſhall not the Miniſtration*

of

of the Spirit be rather Glorious. So again, ver. 9. *If the Miniſtration of Condemnation be Glory, much more doth the Miniſtration of Righteouſneſs exceed in Glory.* Wherein we cannot but obſerve, that the Apoſtle doth evidently Reflect upon the fore-mentioned Paſſage in *Exod.* 34. 28, 29, &c. Where we are told, that *Moſes* Received from God the two Tables of Stone, wherein the words of the Covenant, even the Ten *Commandments*, were Written and Engraven by the Finger of God himſelf; and this Expreſly under the Denomination of the *Covenant*, which God then made with *Iſrael*, *Deut.* 4. 13. Which made *Moſes* his Face to ſhine, ſo that *Aaron* and all the Children of *Iſrael* were afraid to come nigh him. 'Tis clear then, that this is the *Covenant* that *Paul* hear ſpeaks of. And what Character or Deſcription doth he give thereof? Why (ſaith he) The Law *Written and Engraven in Stones*, (how Glorious ſoever it was in it ſelf) was of a *Killing Nature*; it was the *Miniſtration of Death and Condemnation*; and that which was to be *done away*. To which ſame purpoſe, the ſame Apoſtle alſo tells us, *Col.* 2. 14. That *Chriſt hath Blotted out the Hand-writing of Ordinances that was againſt us, which was contrary to us, and hath took it out of the way, nailing it to his Croſs.* Where the Apoſtle ſpeaks plainly of the ſame thing, and to the ſame purpoſe, as he doth to the *Corinthians*; for there he ſpeaks of the Law Written in Stones, which (ſaith he) was a Miniſtration of Death and Condemnation. And hereof the Hand-writing of Ordinances that was againſt us, and contrary to us, (as the Law muſt needs be, if it was indeed no other than a Miniſtration of Death and Condemnation, as the Apoſtle deſcribes it.) But is the Covenant of Faith of this Nature? Or was the Covenant of Grace a Miniſtration of Death and Condemnation, as the Apoſtle Affirms the Law written in Stones to be? Was the Covenant of Grace againſt us, Contrary to us, and therefore now Blotted out, done away, taken out of the way, and Nailed to the Croſs of Chriſt, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Hand-writing of Ordinances, or the Law written in Stones? Theſe are Soleciſms too ſtrong for Digeſtion. It can never be imagined. And yet all this muſt needs follow, if the Law was a Covenant of Grace, as is Affirmed. 'Tis true, there was a Covenant of Grace that ran Current therewith, (as hath been before declared) whereby *Moſes* and all the Elect among that People, were delivered from the *Curſe* of that *Fiery Burning Law*, that was thus given them. But ſhall we therefore call the Miniſtration of Death, a Miniſtration of Grace? Or the miniſtration of Condemnation, a Miniſtration of Life and Righteouſneſs, which the Apoſtle doth ſo plainly ſet in Oppoſition thereunto? Or ſhall we ſay, that that which was againſt us, and contrary to us, was a *Covenant of Grace*, or for the *Subſtance* of it ſuch? The Apoſtle (as we have already ſeen) tells us the quite

contrary

contrary. And so he doth *Rom.* 7. 9, 10. *When the Commandment came* (saith he) *Sin Revived, and I Died: And the Commandment which was Ordained to Life, I found to be unto Death.* And how then can it be justly Affirmed, that the Law was a *Covenant of Gospel-Grace*, or that it was such for the *Substance* thereof, when the Apostle found it by Experience to be a Ministration of Death.

§. 5. Indeed the World Groans under the Burthen of such Subtile Sophistical Distinctions, whereby the Truths of the Gospel have been so long Obscured, as they have been, and are, in respect of the present Point; a Point of such vast Consequence and Concernment to the Church of God. For what can be of greater Moment than the *Two Covenants*; the Truths concerning which, are as the two Master Veins that branch themselves forth, and lye dispersed up and down, throughout the whole Body of the Scriptures? If therefore it shall be found that we have been all this while Mistaken in our Notion about the Covenants, what they are, and which they be; or that we have given the Appellation of the Covenant of Grace, to a Covenant of Works; and hereon have built up an Answerable Superstructure of Faith and Practice; how great will such a Miscarriage prove to be at last? Indeed, there is no part of the Christian Faith or Practice, but must one way or other have been Influenced and Corrupted thereby. Accordingly hence hath sprung that *Jumbling* or *Confounding* of Law and Gospel together, which the Spirit of God doth so *Distinguishingly* represent unto us in the Word of Truth; and which the Apostle doth so severely Rebuke the Teachers among the *Galatians*, concerning. *I Marvel* (saith he, Gal. 1. 6, 7.) *that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the Grace of Christ, unto another Gospel, which is, not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would Pervert the Gospel of Christ.* They would Pervert it, that is, they would change it, Overthrow it, and turn it upside down; by mingling Law and Gospel together; pretend unto the Gospel, and yet seek for Righteousness, as it were by the Works of the Law. But certainly, as we are not *to Seperate or put asunder what God hath Conjoyned*; *so neither are we to mingle what God hath Separated, and doth plainly Distinguish.* The Law is not the Gospel; nor is the Gospel the Law. These two are distinct, and must be kept so; as having their Distinct Services, and in their proper Places. To call therefore the Covenant of Works a Covenant of Faith; or the Legal Covenant deliver'd on Mount *Sinai*, a Covenant of Grace; is no other than to Blend or Confound Law and Gospel together, as if they were the same thing, and no distinction at all to be made betwixt them, only in respect of the different Degrees or clearness of the Revelation of Gospel Grace.

§. 6. But whatever we may Imagine, the Apostle doth most plainly

ly distinguish betwixt Law and Gospel, and that in Respect of the whole Entire Nature, Essence, or Subsistance of either. *Tell me* (saith he, Gal. 4. 21. &c.) *You that desire to be under the Law, do ye not hear the Law?* Know you not that *Abraham* had two Sons, the one by a Bondwoman, the other by Free; the one Born after the Flesh, the other by Promise? And know you not that this was plainly Typical of the two Covenants, the Legal and the Gospel? And that these two must needs be therefore Essentially Different, as much as Bondage is from Liberty: Or a Birth after the Flesh, from that by promise? *Tell me* (saith he) *You that desire to be under the Law, do ye not hear the Law?* Doth not the Old Testament it self speak this Language to you? But whom doth the Apostle mean when he speaks of them that *desire to be under the Law?* 'Tis strange that after the Gospel took place, any should desire to be under the Law; or that any should be desirous of returning to that old and former Yoke of Bondage, they had so long been Labouring under, and were now delivered from: To be under the Law is not to be under Grace: For these two are directly opposite. Rom. 6. 14. *Sin shall not have Dominion over you for ye are not under the Law, but under Grace.* But yet nevertheless, it seems such there were, even in the Apostle's time, who were desirous *to be under the Law*: And 'tis as plain that such there are now. But who are they? Why they are plainly those that Affirm *that the Law is a Covenant of Faith*, or a *Covenant of Grace*. Those must needs be of the Number of them that desire to be under the Law. And how can it be otherwise? For ought we not to submit our selves to a Covenant of Faith, and Subject our selves under the Power and Dominion of Gospel Grace? If therefore we affirm that the Law is a Covenant of Faith, or a Covenant of Grace, we cannot be true to our own Principles, if we do not desire to be under it, and under the Power and Dominion of it; and that not barely as a *Rule of Life* (which we all grant) but as *a Covenant of Life*, or as a *Covenant of Faith and Grace*, as it is affirmed to be. But if we are desirous to be under the Law. (let our Notion thereof be what it will; that it is a Covenant of Works, or a Covenant of Grace) This is the direct and ready way for *Christ to become of no Effect unto us*. For (saith the Apostle, Gal. 5, 4.) *Whosoever of you are Justified by the Law, ye are fallen from Grace.* And Consequently, instead of being not under the Law, but under Grace, (as the same Apostle speaks of the believing *Romans*.) We are rather under the Law, and not under Grace. For these two are there (as well as in many other places besides) plainly distinguished as quite Opposite the one unto the other: So that if we are under the one, we are not under the other. If we are under Grace, we are not under the Law; And if we are under the Law, we are not under Grace.

§ 7. Hence

§. 7. But, *tell me* (saith *Paul* in the forementioned, Gal. 4 21: &c.) *You that desire to be under the Law; Do you not hear the Law? For it is Written, that* Abraham *had two Sons, the one by a Bond-Maid, the other by a Free-Woman. But he who was of the Bond-Woman, was born after the Flesh: But he of the Free-Woman, by Promise. Which things are an Allegory: For these are the two Covenants; the one from Mount* Sinai, *which gendereth to Bondage, which is* Agar: *For this* Agar *is Mount* Sinai *in* Arabia, *and answereth to* Jerusalem *which now is, and is in Bondage with her Children. But* Jerusalem *which is above, is free, which is the Mother of us all. For it is Written, Rejoyce thou barren that bearest not, &c. Now we Brethren* (saith he) *as* Isaac *was, are the Children of the Promise.* Wherein the Apostle doth make a plain Distetence between the two Covenants, the Legal and the Gospel, in the very *Radical Nature*, or *Effence* of either; Not in point of the *Degrees* of the Manifestation of *Gospel Grace* (as is by many Divines suggested) For the Law Written in Stones discovers none at all. *The Covenant from Mount* Sinai (saith our Apostle,) *gendereth to Bondage: For this* Agar *is Mount* Sinai *in* Arabia, *and is in Bondage with her Children.* So that Mount *Sinai* Covenant is no other than a *Bondage* Covenant; it *gendereth to Bondage*; this is the natural scope, and tendency of it; and accordingly all *her Children are in Bondage.* And therefore, unless we shall say that the Covenant of Faith gendereth to Bondage; Or that the Covenant of Grace is a Bondage Covenant; And that all those that are under it, or are the Children of it, are in Bondage; we can by no means allow that Mount *Sinai* Covenant was ever designed by God as a Covenant of Faith, or as a Covenant of Grace, as by many Divines it is Confidently Affirmed to be. And therefore also, All those that desire to be under it (which cannot be avoided by those that affirm it to be a Covenant of Faith) must of necessity (according to the Apostles Reckoning) be desirous of Returning to that old Bondage which Christ hath delivered us from; and which the Apostle doth so earnestly Exhort us to avoid, Gal. 5. 1. *Stand fast therefore in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not Intangled again with the Yoke of Bondage.*

§. 8. But though Mount *Sinai* Covenant (which answered to *Jerusalem* that then was) is a *Bondage Covenant*; The Gospel Covenant (saith the Apostle, which answereth to *Jerusalem* that is above) *is free, which is the Mother of us all.* The Gospel

Covenant therefore being a free Covenant; It must not, it ought not to be Blended, or Mixt with that from Mount *Sinai*, as if the one were the other, and no difference at all to be made betwixt them; onely in Respect of the different Degrees of the Discovery of Gospel-Grace. No (saith the Apostle) *What saith the Scripture? Cast out the Bond-Woman and her Son! For the Son of the Bond-Woman shall not be Heir with the Son of the Free-Woman. So then Brethren, we are not Children of the Bond-Woman, but of the Free.* In the 30. and 31. *Verses* of the forementioned 4th to the *Galatians*. And this we must be; And thus we must do (as the Apostle here adviseth us) unless we shall mingle Law and Gospel together; Bondage and Liberty; Works and Grace; Death and Life; And a ministration of Condemnation with that of Righteousness and Peace: Which would be no other, than (as much as in us lies) to overthrow the whole Gospel, and to obscure, darken and confound those truths that are of highest Importance; And which ought therefore to be carefully and distinctly handled by us, according to the different Services they are designed and appointed for.

SECT. VIII.

BUT then, we are yet further told by Mr. *Sedgwick* in his forementioned Discourse, *pag.* 174. 'That that Covenant 'which was Confirmed by Bloud and Sprinkling (which Typified 'the Bloud of Christ, Confirming and Ratifying the Covenant) 'was no Covenant of Works. But the Covenant which God made 'then with the *Israelites* was Confirmed by Blood, *Exod.* 24. 7. 'Moses *took the Book of the Covenant, and read it in the Audience 'of the People. And they said; All that the Lord hath said we will 'do and be Obedient,* Vers. 8. *And Moses took the Bloud and Sprink-'led it on the People; And said; Behold the Bloud of the Covenant 'which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.* 'Now this very place is quoted by the Apostle, Heb. 9. 19. *He 'Sprinkled both the Book and the People,* Vers. 20. *Saying, This is 'the Bloud of the Testament, which God hath Enjoyned you.* 'And expressly Interprets it, and applies it to the Bloud of Christ, '*Vers.* 14. and *Vers.* 23. And therefore that Covenant with that 'People was not a Covenant of Works; which never was, nor shall 'be Confirmed by the Bloud of Christ.

§. 2. To

§. 2. To which we Reply, First, That it is Evident, that the Covenant, the Bloud whereof *Moses* Sprinkled on the People, in the forementioned, Exod. 24. 7, 8. Could not possibly be the Law Written in Stones; which will appear in a diligent Examination of the words before and after Vers. 3, 4. Moses *came and told the People all the words of the Lord, and all the Judgments. And all the People Answered with one Voice, and said; All the words which the Lord hath spoken we will do. And* Moses *Wrote all the words of the Lord and rose up early in the Morning and builded an Altar,* &c. Vers. 5. *And he sent Young Men of the Children of* Israel, *which offered burnt offerings, and Sacrificed Peace offerings of Oxen unto the Lord,* Vers. 6. *And* Moses *took half of the Bloud, and put it in Basons; And half of the Bloud he Sprinkled on the Altar,* Vers. 7. *And he took the Book of the Covenant, and read in the Audience of the People. And they said; All that the Lord hath said we will do, and be Obedient,* Vers. 8. *And* Moses *took the Bloud, and Sprinkled it on the People, and said, behold the Bloud of the Covenant which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.* Now that the Book of the Covenant here spoken of, the Bloud whereof was thus Sprinkled on the People; could not be the Law Written in Stones; appears most evidently from the following words, Vers. 9. *Then went up* Moses *and* Aaron, Nadab *and* Abihu, *and Seventy of the Elders of* Israel; *And they saw the God of* Israel, &c. Vers. 12. *And the Lord said unto* Moses; *Come up to me into the Mount, and be there; And I will give thee Tables of Stone, and a Law and Commandments; which I have Written, that thou mayst teach them.* Wherein first we cannot but observe; That whereas the words of the Covenant, the Bloud whereof was Sprinkled on the People, *Vers.* 8. are expresly said, *Vers.* 4. to be Written by *Moses*; So on the other hand, the Law Written in Stones is here expresly said to be Written by *God himself.* And Secondly, It is also as evident that *Moses* had not as yet so much as received the Law Written in Stones from God, till after he had Sprinkled the Bloud of the forementioned Covenant (wherein the Statutes and Judgments were contained) upon the People. So that the Law Written in Stones therefore could not possibly be the Covenant the Bloud whereof was so Sprinkled; but was indeed another Covenant, and delivered at a distinct Season, and in a distinct Method; the one uttered and declared by the Mouth of God himself, in the Audience of all the People; the other delivered unto them by the Mouth and Ministration of *Moses* onely. The one Written with

Gods own Finger in the two Tables of Stone; the other Written in a Book by the Hand of *Moses*; which is accordingly here called *the Book of the Covenant*, by way of distinction from the *Tables of Stone*. From whence by the way it clearly appears; That that Covenant, which as *Moses* elsewhere assures us, God himself with his own Immediate Mouth and Voice declared unto *Israel*; and that in the Audience of all the People, *Deut.* 4. 10, 11, 12, 13. was in this as well as in other respects, as much a Covenant of Works as that made with our first Parent: For if the Covenant made with *Adam* had no *Mediator*; so neither had *this*. 'Tis plain indeed that God made use of the Ministration of *Moses* in the delivery of the *Ceremonial Covenant*; but not so in the Promulgation of *this*: For this was both Written and declared Immediately by the Hand and Mouth of God himself.

§. 3. But to return; Whereas Mr. *Sedgwick* tells us; 'That 'that Covenant with that People, *which was Confirmed by Bloud* 'and Sprinkling (*which Typified the Blood of Christ Confirming* 'and Ratifying the Covenant) *was not a Covenant of Works, which* 'never was nor shall be Confirmed by the Blood of Christ'; and makes no distinction thereon, between the Ceremonial Covenant, that was Dedicated with Bloud, and the Law Written in Stones, that was not so Dedicated; How strangely doth he Confound and Obscure the word and truth of God, which ought to have been cleared, and distinctly to have been declared to those he had Preached or Written unto? For first he seems to take it for granted that there was no other Covenant made with *Israel* at *Sinai*, but what was Confirmed, by Bloud. And Secondly, That that Covenant which was so Confirmed must of necessity have been Confirmed also by the Blood of Christ Typified thereby, and therefore not a Covenant of Works. But both these are no other than ungrounded suppositions that want a Foundation.

§. 4. For first, It hath been already proved, That the Law Written in Stones had not been so much as received from God, when the Ceremonial Covenant was so Confirmed. And accordingly it was so far from being Confirmed by the Bloud of Christ, that we do not read that it was ever Dedicated with any other sort of Bloud whatsoever. It is indeed suggested that the Law Written in Stones by Gods own Finger, had been also Written by *Moses* in the Book of the Covenant wherein the Statutes and Judgments were contained, when the Bloud thereof was sprinkled on the People; Since we are told, Exod. 24. 3, 4. That *Moses*

came

came and told the People all the Words of the Lord, and all the Judgments. And Moſes *Wrote all the Words of the Lord, and took the Book of the Covenant, and Read in the Audience of the People, and took the Blood and Sprinkled it on the People; ſaying, Behold the Blood of the Covenant which the Lord hath made with you, concerning all theſe Words.* But if we duly attend unto the Scope of the Spirit of God, in theſe paſſages, we ſhall find it utterly Improbable, that the *Ten Commandments* that had been Written in Stones with Gods own Finger, were at all contained in the Book of the Covenant, when the Blood thereof was Sprinkled on the People: Forasmuch as God afterwards calls up *Moſes* into the Mount, ſaying, *I will give thee Tables of Stone, and a Law and Commandments which I have Written, that thou mayeſt teach them*, Ver. 12. Which clearly Implies that the *Ten Commandments*, which was the only matter contained in the two Tables of Stone, had not been Written by *Moſes* in the Book of the Covenant, wherein the Statutes and Judgments were contained, and which he had accordingly Read in the Audience of the People: For then it had been altogether Improper to ſay, *I will give thee Tables of Stone, and a Law and Commandments, that thou mayeſt teach them.* Since, according to this Reckoning, *Moſes* had already done it. When we are told therefore that *Moſes came and told the People all the Words of the Lord, and all the Judgments*, &c. We are plainly to underſtand it according to *Deut.* 4. 13. 14. where having Informed us that *the Lord himſelf declared unto them his Covenant which he commanded them to perform, even Ten Commandments, and he Wrote them upon two Tables of Stone*: He Expreſly adds, *The Lord Commanded me* (ſaith he) *at that time, to teach you Statutes and Judgments.* And accordingly, *Exod.* 24. 3. *Moſes came and told the People all the Words of the Lord, and all the Judgments*; That is, all the Statutes, and all the Judgments, not the *Ten Commandments*: For that God himſelf had already declared unto them, with his own Mouth. So that it is evident that it was the Statutes and Judgments only that *Moſes* had *then* in Commiſſion, to declare unto the People. And accordingly it is as evident, that it was the Statutes and Judgments only, that were contained in the Book of the Covenant, when the Blood thereof was ſprinkled on the People; Though afterwards it is plain, that upon the Receiving of the two Tables of Stone, wherein the Ten Commandments were Inſerted, he had a freſh Commiſſion to teach them the Ten Commandments alſo, as appears by Verſe 12. And which we find was accordingly performed by him, *Deut.* 5. in the Several Ten Branches, or Particulars thereof.

§. 5. It is therefore a great miſtake for any to affirm, that the Law written in Stones, was not a Covenant of Works, becauſe confirmed by Blood and Sprinkling; whereas, when it comes to be duly examined, there appears no ſuch matter: but inſtead of being proved thereby to be a Covenant of Grace, it is the more convincingly proved to be as it is indeed, no other than a Covenant of Works. In which reſpect Mr. *Sedgwick*'s forementioned Argument may more juſtly and truly be thus formed.

That Covenant that was not confirmed by the Blood of Chriſt (which alone can cleanſe us from all unrighteouſneſs) no, nor ſo much as by the Blood of Bulls, or Goats, or Calves, which was plainly typical thereof; could not poſſibly be a Covenant of Grace, but of Works: But the Law written in Stones, was ſo far from being confirmed by the Blood of Chriſt; that it was never (that we read of) confirmed by any other ſort of Blood whatſoever. Therefore that Covenant could not poſſibly be a Covenant of Grace but of Works.

§. 6. *Secondly*, Whereas the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 9. ſpeaking of the Ceremonial Covenant, which was dedicated by Blood and Sprinkling; doth plainly repreſent it unto us under the denomination of *the firſt Covenant that had a Worldly Sanctuary*, verſ. 1. Oppoſing it to Chriſt, as the *Figure* to the *Subſtance*, verſ. 9. Calling the Statutes and Judgments therein contained by the name of *Carnal Ordinances*; and ſuch as *could not make him that did the Service Perfect, as pertaining to the Conſcience*, verſ. 10. *Another Building*, verſ. 11. And *the Firſt Teſtament*, as it's Contradiſtinguiſh'd from the *New-Teſtament*, and Chriſt the true and only Sacrifice thereof, *verſ.* 18, 19. Beſides what he had told us in the 8th Chap. concerning this ſame Firſt, or Old-Teſtament; that it was of a *faulty, decaying, vaniſhing nature*, verſ. 7, 13. From all this it plainly appears, that even the *Ceremonial Covenant* it ſelf, could be no other than *a Covenant of Works*, as well as that written in Stones. And accordingly the Apoſtle informs us, *Gal.* 3. 10. That *as many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curſe: For it is written, Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them.* Which Book of the Law, here ſpoken of, muſt of neceſſity be the Book of the Covenant, written by *Moſes* himſelf, wherein the *Statutes and Judgments*, or the Ceremonial Precepts, were contained. In reſpect whereof it is evident, that though the Sacrifices, and other things thereunto belonging, pointed at Chriſt,

and

and the way of Salvation by him; yet such was the severity of the Divine Sanction thereunto annexed; that if those under that Administration had wrought never so hard, and kept themselves in a Path of perfect and Universal Obedience to the multitude of those Ceremonial Precepts all their days, (which was impossible;) yet if at last (as there happened to be never so small a transgression, though in the least Circumstance, the Curse of the Law presently took hold upon them, and that without mercy. For (as *James* saith) *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one Point, he is guilty of all*: And accordingly the Curse of the Law was pronounced upon *every one that continued not in all things therein commanded, to do them*. This is the true Scope and Tenor even of the *Ceremonial Covenant it self*, to all under it, that were not relieved by the Grace of the Gospel.

§. 7. Wherefore, though it is plain, that the *Law written in Stones*, and the Book wherein the *Statutes* and *Judgments* were contained, were two distinct Covenants, and delivered at distinct Seasons, and in a distinct Method; the one with, the other without a Mediator; the one dedicated with Blood and Sprinkling, the other (that we read of) not so dedicated; yet it is as clear from the Premises, that they were both of the same *Nature*; that is, no other than *a Covenant of Works*, and accordingly both now Repealed, and that under the Denomination of the *First, or Old Covenant, which was of a decaying, vanishing nature*. Heb. 8 ult. And accordingly, though the Blood of the Legal Sacrifices, wherewith the Ceremonial Covenant was dedicated, was plainly *Typical* of the Blood of Christ; yet forasmuch as the Apostle informs us, *it could not take away sins, nor make the Comers thereunto perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience*; Heb. 9. 9. Chap. 10. 1, 4. That Covenant therefore which was dedicated only by the Blood of such Sacrifices, could never be a Covenant of Grace, properly so called, (which hath Christ alone for the Mediator thereof, and was confirmed only by his Blood and Sufferings for us) but of Works.

§. 8. Besides, If the Ceremonial Covenant, which was thus dedicated by Blood and Sprinkling, had been indeed a Covenant of Grace, and confirmed also by the Blood of Christ; why should it be *Repealed*, as we know it was (as well as the Law written in Stones, which is said to be now *done away*?) Is it possible that a Covenant of Grace, confirmed by the Blood of Christ, should ever be *Repealed*? Or why did God appoint the New Covenant

to succeed it, which *was Really so Confirmed*, and which is also opposed thereunto as *another* Covenant, and of a quite different Nature? Unless we shall say, that there were two Covenants of Grace Confirmed by the Blood of Christ; the one whereof was of a *faulty, decaying, vanishing Nature*, as the First Covenant is by the Spirit of God himself described; which to affirm, would be perfectly to Contradict the whole Scope of the Scriptures.

§. 9. The Blood of those Sacrifices therefore, wherewith the Ceremonial Covenant was dedicated, together with the rest of the Types that were then afforded, served only as an *Example, Figure, and Shadow of Heavenly things*. They were not (as the Apostle speaks) *The Heavenly things themselves*, Heb. 9. 23. *For the Law* (saith he, Heb. 10. 1, &c.) *having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things, can never with those Sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the Commers thereunto perfect: For then they should not have ceased to be Offered, because that the Worshippers once purged, should have had no more Conscience of Sins. But in these Sacrifices, there is a remembrance again made of Sins every year: For it is not possible that the Blood of Bulls and of Goats should take away Sins.* All those Sacrifices therefore, could never amount to the value of the Blood of Christ. And accordingly, that Covenant, though dedicated by Blood and Sprinkling, was no other than a *Covenant of Works*, for as much as it was not confirmed by the Blood of Christ: For if it had, it would have *made the Commers thereunto Perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience*; which it did not.

§. 10. Besides, the Apostle expressly tells us, That *Christ hath obtained a more Excellent Ministry*, than that of *Moses*; *by how much also he is the Mediator of a Better Covenant, which was Established upon better Promises*, Heb. 8. 6. Which *Better Covenant*, the Apostle doth plainly oppose unto *the First*, or *Old Covenant*, verse. 7, 8, 9, 13. From whence it plainly follows, that Christ was not the Mediator of the First, or Old Covenant, unless we shall say, that he was the Mediator of two Covenants, a Better and a Worse: And consequently it doth as plainly follow, that the First Covenant was no other than a Covenant of Works, since neither was Christ the Mediator of it; nor did he ever shed his Blood for the Confirmation thereof.

SECT. IX.

SECT. IX.

HAving thus far considered Mr. *Obadiah Sedgwick's* Arguments, wherewith he labours to prove that the *Sinai* Covenant was not a Covenant of Works, but of Grace: We should next have considered Mr. *Francis Roberts* his Arguments also to the same purpose, in his large Discourse upon the Covenants; But that the most substantial part of them have been already dispatcht in the Answers we have returned to Mr. *Sedgwick's* Arguments. Onely we cannot but take notice of two grand Absurdities which Mr. *Roberts*, and all others who Assert that *the* Sinai *Covenant was a Covenant of Faith*, do, and cannot but unavoidably run into, and fasten upon the Scriptures, on that Hypothesis. The first is this; Whereas Mr. *Roberts* pretending to Answer several Objections which are urged by way of opposition to his forementioned Doctrine, the Fourth Objection which he mentions, *pag.* 769. of his forementioned Discourse, runs thus;

§. 2. *Object.* 4. 'The *Sinai* Covenant is opposed by the Pro-'phet *Jeremy*, and by the Apostle *Paul*, to the New Covenant, 'and is said to be broken by the People of *Israel*, *Jer.* 31. 31, 32, '*&c. Heb.* 8. 8, 9, 10. Therefore it is not a Covenant of Faith, 'which is everlasting and cannot be broken; But a Covenant of 'works, which is but Temporary and liable to be broken.

This is indeed a substantial Argument or Objection against, what he Asserts; But how substantially answered may appear by what follows: For thus he returns thereunto.

'These Premises (saith he) will not bear this Conclusion, 'for first, though the *Sinai* Covenant made with *Israel*, when God 'brought them out of the Land of *Egypt*, is said to be *unlike*, or '*not according to the New Covenant*; yet it is not said either by 'the Prophet or Apostle, to be *unlike to the Covenant of Faith.*

§. 3. *Reply.* But what a strange Evasion is this? And whither will not Men run when left to themselves? For is not the New Covenant a Covenant of Faith? And therefore when the *Sinai* Covenant is opposed to the New Covenant; is it not plainly opposed to the Covenant of Faith? Or shall we make the New-Covenant, and the Covenant of Faith opposite, and Contradistinct the one from the other, as Mr. *Roberts* plainly doth; when he saith,

faith, that though the *Sinai* Covenant is oppoſed to the New Covenant; yet it is not oppoſed to the Covenant of Faith: As if the New Covenant and the Covenant of Faith, were not one and the ſame thing? But certainly the New Covenant, to which the *Sinai* Covenant is oppoſed, muſt needs be a Covenant of Faith, or there is no Covenant of Faith mentioned in the Scriptures; And conſequently ſince the *Sinai* Covenant is both by the Prophet and Apoſtle, ſo plainly oppoſed to the New Covenant, from hence it plainly follows, that it was never deſigned by God as a Covenant of Faith: For elſe why is it oppoſed thereunto?

§. 4. 'But (ſaith Mr. *Roberts*) the Diſſimilitude or Difference 'here Intimated betwixt the *Sinai Covenant* and *the New Cove-'nant*, is not in *ſubſtance or kind*: For in both the Lord ſaith, 'I *will be their God, and they ſhall be my People*; But only in the 'manner of *Adminiſtration* or *Degree*: God promiſing in the 'New *Covenant* a greater, fuller, and clearer Meaſure of Grace 'unto his People, than under the *Sinai Covenant*. Whereof he gives Three Inſtances, in point of Sanctification, Illumination, and Remiſſion. And then Concludes; 'Thus (ſaith he) the '*Sinai Covenant*, *gradually*, not *ſpecifically*, differs from the *New* 'Covenant. They are both *Covenants of Faith*: But the *New* 'Covenant every way more Excellent, Compleat, and Perfect.

§. 5. To this we reply, That as the Diſſimilitude or Difference here Intimated betwixt the *Sinai Covenant* and the *New Covenant*, is not in *Subſtance*; Since in both the Lord ſaith, *I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People*: So neither in the *manner of Adminiſtration*; that is, If by the manner of Adminiſtration, we underſtand the *Meaſure* or *Degrees* of the Divine Bleſſedneſs therein Promiſed. For what can be a greater, or more Comprehenſive Bleſſedneſs, than for *God to be their God*, and *they to be his People*? For this Comprehends Juſtification, Sanctification and Illumination, in the heighth and Perfection of them. And indeed what is not promiſed where God is promiſed? And accordingly this is the Bleſſedneſs promiſed in both Covenants. The Difference or Diſſimilitude, therefore, betwixt the *Sinai Covenant* and the *New Covenant*, upon the Account whereof they are here oppoſed the one unto the other, muſt of neceſſity Conſiſt in the *terms of either*, and in that alone. *For* Moſes (ſaith the Apoſtle Rom. 10. 5.) *deſcribeth the Righteouſneſs of the Law, that the Man which doth theſe things ſhall live by them.* Whereas Life and happineſs is promiſed in the Goſpel Covenant in *the*

way

way of believing onely, from *Verſ.* 6. to 12. And indeed nothing ſhort of this can be duely ſuppoſed as the ground of ſuch an oppoſition as here Inſiſted on: For can it be rationally imagined, that a bare difference in the *Extents or Degrees* of the Divine Bleſſedneſs promiſed in either, could be a ſufficient ground for the Prophet or Apoſtle to ſpeak as they do, that the *New Covenant* was *not like*, or *not according to the* Sinai *Covenant*? For if the *Subſtance* be the ſame, there is ſtill a *likeneſs* between them, though in Reſpect of *Degrees* Circumſtantially *different*. A Child hath the *likeneſs* of a Man, though not grown up to a *Perfect Stature*. But if the Difference or Diſſimilitude lie in the *terms* of either, and thoſe terms *Eſſentially* different; Then, though the Promiſes are the ſame for the *Subſtance* of them, and the *Degrees* of the Mercy promiſed alſo; yet it may be juſtly and properly ſaid, that the one is *not like*, or *not according* to the other: For as *Covenants*, they are *Eſſentially* different, becauſe the *terms* are ſo. And accordingly it is evident, both from the forementioned *Rom.* 10. 5, 6, *&c.* as alſo from *Jer.* 31. and *Heb.* 8. Where the *Sinai Covenant*, is oppoſed to the *New Covenant*, that whereas the Promiſes of the *Sinai Covenant* run all upon *condition of Univerſal and Perfect Obedience* to whatſoever the Law requireth; the Promiſes of the *New Covenant* are all of them *Abſolute*, and therefore onely to be *received by Faith*: For as therein God promiſeth that *he will put his Laws in their Mind, and write them in their Hearts*: So he doth alſo freely Promiſe, *that he will be Merciful to their Unrighteouſneſs, and their Sins and Iniquities will be remember no more*. All which promiſes of Grace were plainly wanting in the *Sinai Covenant*: For that required *Obedience*, as the *Condition* of Life, but gave no *ſtrength* to perform it; And not onely ſo, but pronounced a dreadful *Curſe upon every Tranſgreſſion and Diſobedience*, leaving no room for Repentance. So that it is plain that the *Sinai Covenant* and the *New Covenant* differ *Specifically*; the One being a Covenant of *Faith*, the Other of *Works*. And on this Account onely are they oppoſed the one unto the other both by *Paul*, and *Jeremy*. In which Reſpect, though the Promiſes in both are the ſame, for *Subſtance*; *I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People*: As alſo in reſpect of the *Degrees* of the Divine Bleſſedneſs promiſed in either; yet the *terms* of Enjoyment being *Eſſentially* different, hence it plainly follows, that ſo are the Covenants themſelves, that is, *Eſſentially*, or *Specifically* different.

§. 6. *Secondly*,

§. 6. *Secondly*, Whereas 'tis justly urged, That since the *Sinai* Covenant is said to be broken by the people of *Israel*, *Jer.* 31. *Heb.* 8. Therefore it is not a Covenant of Faith, which is Everlasting and cannot be broken; but a Covenant of Works, which is but temporary and liable to be broken. To this Mr. *Roberts* returns thus;

'Though (saith he) *Israel* brake the *Sinai* Covenant by their 'Idolatry; yet they brake it not utterly and Irreparably, as *Adam* 'brake the Covenant of Works by his first Transgression: For 'God admitted them to Repentance; upon their Repentance 'Pardons them; and renews the *Sinai* Covenant again with them. 'Therefore this Breach of Covenant doth no way prove the *Sinai* 'Covenant to be a Covenant of Works, not of Faith; Temporary, 'not Everlasting.

§. 7. *Reply.* But why should any part of the truth of God be concealed, which was so necessary here to have been discovered? For though the *Sinai* Covenant was renewed in the Second Tables, after the first were broken, upon the Idolatry of the *Israelites* about the Golden Calf, *Exod.* 34. Yet it clearly appears, and we cannot be Ignorant, that afterward it was utterly broken, and they Rejected, as they are to this Day. Else why doth God say, *which my Covenant they brake, they continued not in it, and I regarded them not*, *Jer.* 31. 32. *Heb.* 8. 9. which plainly looks further than the *first Breach*: For it is clear that after the first Breach *they were regarded by God*, since upon *Moses* his Intercession they were admitted to Repentance; and it is evident that upon their Repentance the Lord Pardons them, and Renews the *Sinai* Covenant again with them. But it is as Evident, that at length having broken it again and again, God plainly tells them that *he Regarded them not*. So that though 'tis true, the *first Breach* doth no way prove the *Sinai Covenant* to be a Covenant of *Works*, not of *Faith*; Temporary, not Everlasting; yet the *after Breaches do*. Else why doth the Apostle tell us as he doth, concerning the same *Sinai* Covenant, that it is dis-annulled, Heb. 7. 18 *For there is verily a dis-annulling of the Commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.* So likewise, Heb. 8. 7. *For if that first Covenant had been faultless, there should no place have been sought for the second.* And Verl. 13. *In that he saith a New Covenant, he hath made the first Old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.* Though the *Sinai Covenant* therefore was *Renewed*

vowed after the *first Breach* thereof; yet the Scriptures do give us a Positive Assurance, that at length it was *utterly* and *irreparably broken*; And so broken, that at last it was *dis-annulled*, made to *Expire*, and *vanish away*, which is utterly Inconsistent with the Nature of the *Covenant of Faith*, according to the whole Scope and Tenour of the Scriptures. So that we see that without a Manifest and Palpable Absurdity, there is no Resisting the force and Evidence of the forementioned Objection. The Conclusion whence Resulting, is therefore highly Rational, and remains firm and unshaken. That since the *Sinai Covenant* is both by the Prophet and Apostle plainly opposed to the *New Covenant*, and is said to be *broken*, and so broken as to Expire and *vanish away*; Therefore it is not a *Covenant of Faith*, which is *Everlasting* and cannot be broken; but a *Covenant of Works*, that was but *Temporary*, and liable thereunto.

As for the *unchangeable* nature of the Covenant of Faith, at least on *God's part*, whatever it is on *our's*; besides a multitude of other Testimonies that might be produced, the 89. *Psalm* gives us a clear and convincing Evidence thereof, Vers. 30, &c. *If his Children forsake my Law, and walk not in my Judgments; if they break my Statutes, and keep not my Commandments; Then will I Visit their Transgression with the Rod, and their Iniquity with Stripes; Nevertheless my Loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail; My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips. Once have I Sworn by my Holiness that I will not lie unto David, his Seed shall endure for ever, and his Throne as the Sun before me. It shall be Established for ever as the Moon, and as a faithful Witness in Heaven.* The like Assurance we have concerning the Promise made to *Abraham*, *Wherein* (saith the Apostle, *Heb.* 6. 17, 18.) *God willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of Promise the Immutability of his Counsel, Confirmed it by an Oath, that by two Immutable things in which it was Impossible for God to lie, we might have strong Consolation*, &c. So that we see, the *Covenant of Faith*, or which is all one, the Covenant of Grace, is every way perfect, unchangeable, unrepealable, and Everlasting. Whereas the *Sinai Covenant*, was of a *faulty*, *decaying*, *vanishing Nature*, and accordingly was at last *dis-annulled*; and therefore could not possibly be any other than a *Covenant of Works*.

§. 8. The Second Absurdity is this. Whereas Mr. *Roberts*, *pag.* 772. of his forementioned Discourse, pretending to Answer the

the Seventh Objection against his Assertion; the Objection it self as himself states it, runs thus.

Object. 7. 'The Condition upon which Life and Happiness is held forth in the Law, or *Sinai* Covenant, is Perfect Doing: *For Moses describeth the Righteousness which is of the Law; that the man which doth those things, shall live by them*, Rom. 10. 5. with Lev. 18. 5. Gal. 3. 12. And he denounceth a Curse upon the least failing; *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them*, Deut. 27. 26. Gal. 3. 10. But the Condition upon which Life and Happiness is tendred in the Covenant of Faith, is *Believing in Christ*, Rom. 10. 6, to 12. Doing, and Believing; Works, and Faith; are two Contrary Conditions of Life: Consequently; the Law, or *Sinai* Covenant, which requires Doing unto Life, cannot be a Covenant of Faith; but must needs be a Covenant of Works.

The Answer which Mr. *Roberts* returns unto this Strong and Substantial Objection; first of all in general runs thus;

'This Objection (saith he) as it is most Obvious to every one, that reads the Epistles of *Paul* to the *Romans*, and *Galatians*; so it is in my judgment, of greatest difficulty to be clearly and satisfactorily *Answered*. And yet it is of great Consequence and Necessity to be Cleared; because otherwise, the true Nature and Intent of this *Sinai Covenant*, as a *Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus*, will not be fully and sufficiently evidenced. Several *Answers* are given. I shall propound them, and pitch upon such as affords best satisfaction. And accordingly he proceeds to give an Account of the Several Answers given thereunto by Mr. *John Ball*, and *Peter Martyr*, by *D. Pareus*, and Mr. *Anthony Burgess*; but neither of these fully pleasing him, p. 975. "I add therefore (saith he) for the unfolding of this *Mystery* more clearly, and for *Answering* of this *Objection* more fully; First, *That the Sinai Covenant was purposely so dispensed, as to render Life and Happiness upon two Opposite, and Contrary Conditions, viz. Works, and Faith; Perfect Doing, and Believing.* This is clear (saith he) by *Paul's* Epistles without Dispute. —— And to deny this which is so clear, will but tend to weaken *Paul's* Authority, to darken many Scriptures, both of *Moses*, and *Paul*, and to strengthen the *Objection*. And so proceeds to make out this Notion.

§. 9. *Reply.* But if ever there was an Absurdity, or plain Contradiction imposed upon the Scriptures; we think we may justly and truly say, that here it is. For though 'tis true, there are those that

that labour to fasten an absurdity upon such as affirm that God's People of old were under two Contrary Covenants, at one and the same time; yet was it ever known, that *the Jews Fountain did at the same time send forth Bitter Waters and Sweet*? Or can it ever be rationally imagined, that the *same Sinai Covenant* was purposely so dispensed, as to tender life and happiness upon two *Opposite* and *Contrary Conditions*? For though 'tis true, two Opposite Covenants may be allowed to be purposely so dispensed, as to tender Life and Happiness upon two Opposite and Contrary Conditions, *Works* and *Faith*; yet it is utterly impossible that the same Covenant should be so dispensed. For as the Apostle reasoneth concerning Election, *Rom.* 11. 6. So it is here; *If by Grace, then it is no more of Works; otherwise Grace is no more Grace. But if it be of Works, then it is no more Grace; otherwise Work is no more Work.* So that we see, according to the Apostles reckoning, it is utterly impossible that two Opposite and Contrary Conditions, should be able to consist together in one and the same Covenant. Either the *Sinai* Covenant therefore is a Covenant of Grace, or it is a Covenant of Works. If it is a *Covenant of Grace*, then according to the scope of the Apostles Reasoning, *it is no more of Works.* And if so, whence is it that *Works* are so plainly required, as the *Condition* of obtaining the mercies therein promised, and which the forementioned Objection doth give such a full demonstration concerning; that it shines with a clear and convincing Evidence in the faces of those that assert it, to be a Covenant of Grace? If therefore it be, as indeed it is, *a Covenant of Works*, and purposely so dispensed, as to tender Life and Happiness upon *Condition of Doing* (which Mr. *Roberts* himself grants) How comes it to be a *Covenant of Grace*, since the Apostle assures us, that *if it be of Works, then it is no more Grace; otherwise Work is no more Work*? So that we see the Scripture allows of no such *Mixture*; and shews us, 'tis impossible that the same Covenant should be so dispensed, as to tender Life and Happiness upon two such Opposite and Contrary Conditions, as *Faith* and *Works*. And yet this *Absurdity*, all those must of necessity run into, that affirm the *Sinai Covenant*, to be a *Covenant of Faith*: Since it is evident and cannot be denied, but that Life and Happiness are therein frequently and plainly tendred upon *Condition of Doing*.

§. 10. 'But (saith *Mr. Roberts*) in this *Sinai Covenant* those 'Opposite Conditions of *Perfect Doing*, under pain of Curse and 'Death; and of *Believing in Christ*, are very differently Requi-

'red

red and Revealed. *Believing in Christ* is revealed very Sparingly and Obscurely. *Perfect Doing*, very frequently and plainly (that by the way is well granted.) But (saith he) though these two Conditions of *Perfect Doing*, and *Believing*, be thus differently Revealed and Required in the *Sinai Covenant*; yet *Believing in Christ* unto Life and Righteousness, was therein chiefly and ultimately intended; and *Perfect Doing* only urged in subordination and tendency to *Believing*. And that *Believing in Christ unto Righteousness*, is chiefly and ultimately intended in the *Sinai Covenant*, is plain from *Moses* himself, drawing the *Righteousness of Faith* from *that* Covenant, *Deut.* 30. 11, to 15. Compared with *Rom.* 10. 6, to 11.

§. 11. *Reply.* But if *Believing in Christ unto Life and Righteousness*, was chiefly and ultimately intended in the *Sinai Covenant*; and *Perfect Doing*, only urged in subordination and tendencie to *Believing*; How comes it to pass that the Apostle doth so directly *oppose* the *Righteousness* of that Covenant to the *Righteousness of Faith*, in the forementioned *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. *For* Moses (saith he) *describeth the Righteousness which is of the Law, that the man which doth these things, shall live by them. But the Righteousness which is of Faith speaketh on this wise*, &c. in a quite different strain and stile. Wherein when he tells us, that the Law saith, *Do this and Live*: How can it be understood, but that his Meaning is, that this is the *Only* Righteousness which the Law requireth, in order to Life and Salvation: Or this is that which it *ultimately* intends, and *no other way* doth it propound in order thereunto: For otherwise we cannot rationally understand him; especially, since he doth elsewhere assure us, that *the Law is not of Faith*, Gal. 3. 12. The Objection against which, from *Deut.* 30. 11, *&c.* Compared with *Rom.* 10. 6, *&c.* (from whence it is inferred, that the *Law* requireth Faith in Christ, in order to Life and Righteousness, as well as the *Gospel*) hath been already Answered in the foregoing parts of this Discourse; where it hath been plainly proved, that the 30th of *Deuteronomy* is taken up with the Description (not of the Covenant at *Sinai*, but) of that New and *Evangelical* Covenant, that God intended to Establish with *Israel in after-times*; and is accordingly represented as a *quite different* Covenant from that at *Sinai*, as plainly appears by the manner of *Paul*'s allegation thereof, *Rom.* 10. 6. And that chiefly, for as much as it required *faith in Christ*, in order to Life and Righteousness, as the Apostle there interprets it. Whereas the *Sinai Covenant* (as both *Paul* and *Moses* himself

self describes it) insists on *Works only*; that *the Man which doth these things shall live by them*. And to say, that these two opposite Conditions may be Required in one and the same *Sinai* Covenant; is plainly to Contradict the Apostle, who in his Interpretation thereof, sets the Righteousness of the Law, and the Righteousness of Faith in direct Opposition the one unto the other, as Inconsistent in one and the same Covenant. *Moses* (saith he) *describeth the Righteousness which is of the Law, that the Man which doth these things shall live by them*. But *the Righteousness which is of Faith speaketh on this wise*, &c. *If thou shalt believe thou shalt be saved*. Whereby he would have us plainly to understand that these are *two opposite Covenants*; Whereas had it been his meaning, that the Law or *Sinai* Covenant was purposely so dispensed as to tender Life and Happiness upon two such *opposite* and *contrary Conditions*, he would not have said that the Law requireth *one thing*, and the Righteousness of Faith, *another*: But that the Law requireth *both*. And therefore it must of necessity follow, that the Apostle speaks of *two contrary Covenants*, requiring two opposite Conditions; It being, indeed, Impossible, that one and the same Covenant should be so dispensed.

§. 12. And here by the way it may be observed, that though Mr. *Baxter* (as hath been already noted in the foregoing part of this Discourse) seems plainly to grant, that the Law or *Sinai* Covenant was no other then a *Covenant of Works*, requiring perfect Obedience as the Condition of Life, unto which *the Righteousness of Faith*, or the Gospel Covenant is opposed by the Apostle, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. Which Gospel Covenant he supposeth to be insisted on, both in the 29th and 30th Chapters of *Deuteronomy*, and that from both, the Apostle drawn that Description of the Righteousness of Faith he speaketh of, making no difference between the Covenants or Promises mentioned in those two Chapters. Mr. *Roberts* on the other hand we see, makes the *Sinai Covenant*, and the *Covenant of Faith* to be all one. For (saith he) 'that believing in Christ unto Righteousness is chiefly and ultimately intended in the *Sinai Covenant*, is plain from *Moses* himself, drawing the Righteousness of Faith from that Covenant, *Deut.* 30. 11, to 15. compared with *Rom.* 10. 6, to 12. So that in this Respect, Mr. *Roberts*, or Mr. *Baxter*, most of necessity be out of the way, either the one or the other, or both of them. For to say as Mr. *Baxter* doth, that though the Righteousness of Faith is by the Apostle opposed unto the Law or *Sinai* Covenant; yet not unto the Covenant mentioned, *Deut.* 29.

reckoning that in the 30th Chapter to be all one with that in the 29th is widely different from the Truth; Since it hath been already plainly proved, that the Covenant mentioned, *Deut.* 29. is of the same Stamp and Tenour with the *Sinai* Covenant, and that both are Essentially different from the Covenant of Faith mentioned, *Deut.* 30. And again, on the other hand, to say as Mr. *Roberts* doth, that the *Sinai Covenant* is a Covenant of Faith; and that *Moses* draws the Righteousness of Faith from that Covenant, would be plainly to contradict Mr. *Baxter*, and not onely so, but would be point blank to contradict the Interpretation given thereof by *Paul himself* in the forementioned *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. where he doth clearly oppose the Righteousness of Faith to the *Sinai* Covenant.

§. 13. Indeed the Principal ground of Mr. *Roberts* his mistake, or that which he seems to lay the greatest stress upon, where he affirms the *Sinai Covenant* to be a *Covenant of Faith*, is this; because the Description that *Paul* gives of the Righteousness of Faith, *Rom.* 10. 6, *&c.* is drawn from the Description that *Moses* gives thereof in the 30th of *Deuteronomy*, as if because the Law was given by *Moses*, the Description he there gives of *the Righteousness of Faith* must needs be understood of the *Sinai Covenant*; whereas it is Evident that *Paul* was of another Mind: For he makes the Description that *Moses* gives thereof the *Righteousness of Faith*, to be quite opposite to the Description that *Moses* elsewhere gives of the *Law* or *Sinai Covenant*. *Moses* (saith he) *describeth the Righteousness of the Law, that the Man which doth these things shall live by them*; which he cites from *Lev.* 18. 5. and *Deut.* 29. 9. Whereas *the Righteousness of Faith*, or the Gospel Covenant speaketh after quite another sort; *Thou if thou shalt believe, thou shalt be saved*; which he quotes from *Deut.* 30. From whence, what can be more Evident, than that he brings in *Moses* describing two *Opposite* and *Essentially different Covenants* in respect of the terms of Life propounded in either? Besides, though the Law was given by *Moses*, whereof he was the alone and onely *Mediator*; yet it is evident, that even *Moses himself* doth give sufficient notice of *another Covenant*, that was to take place in *after times*; and that not onely in the forementioned 30th of *Deuteronomy*, but in the 18th Chapter, which is also noted by the Apostle *Peter*, *Acts* 3. 22. *Moses truly said unto the Fathers, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your Brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.* *Moses* therefore gives them sufficient notice

of

of another Covenant, and not onely so, but of *another Prophet* also that God would raise up unto them to be the *Mediator* thereof. And that this *other Prophet* was to be the Mediator of *another Covenant*, is plain from what the Author to the *Hebrews* tells us, *Chap.* 8. 6. *But now* (saith he) *hath he obtained a more Excellent Ministry* (to wit, than that of *Moses* spoken of in the foregoing Verse) *by how much also he is the Mediator of a Better Covenant which was Established upon Better Promises.*

§. 14. So that it is Evident, that the Covenant made with *Israel* at *Mount Sinai*, *Exod.* 19. and 20. which was afterward renewed with them in the Land of *Moab*, *Deut.* 29. is *another* Covenant and *Essentially* different from the *Covenant of Faith*, or the Gospel Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 30. *Rom.* 10. 6, &c. And that not onely since the *terms are Essentially different*, but since it hath also *another and far different Mediator*. Wherefore the forementioned Objection, notwithstanding the Apostles Testimony, remains firm and cannot be Evaded; That *the Law is not of Faith*. And accordingly whatever Subordination or Tendency the Law hath to drive us to the Covenant of Faith for Relief and Shelter, to be sure the Law it self gives us no Relief: For neither chiefly nor Ultimately doth it *propound Faith* as the *Condition of Life*, but *Doing* onely; and consequently is *another Covenant*, and *Essentially* different from the *Covenant of Faith* to which it drives us. *The Law* (saith *Moses*) *requireth Doing unto Life*. The *Gospel* (saith *Paul*) *requireth Faith*. *And these* (saith he Gal. 4. 24, 25, 26,) *are the two Covenants; the One from Mount Sinai in* Arabia, *and answereth to* Jerusalem *that now is; the Other to* Jerusalem *that is above; the one gendering to Bondage; the other to Liberty; the one a Ministration of Death, and Condemnation; the other a Ministration of Life and Righteousness*, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 8, 9. Now whom shall we believe? Whether *Paul*, who affirms that these are *two Covenants*; and who in effect also affirms that these two Covenants are *Essentially* and *Specifically different*, in respect of the *terms* propounded in either (as well as also in respect of the consequent *Issues* thereof) to such as are under them: Or those that affirm that *the Sinai Covenant was purposely so dispensed, as to tender Life and Happiness upon two opposite and contrary Conditions?*

§. 15. But we shall Proceed no further in the Confutation of this Un-scriptural Notion. What hath been already said being (if we mistake not) sufficient to overthrow the whole of what

Mr. *Roberts* delivers in his Voluminous Discourse toward the Proof of his grand Position; *That the Law was given to Israel at Mount Sinai, as a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus.* Onely it ought to be duely Considered, that it will be of no small Consequence to the Church of God, if it shall be at last found that such Doctrines as these have sadly tended to the Obscuring and Confounding many Gospel Truths. But sufficient hints of this Nature having been already given, we shall leave it unto the Godly Wise to determine upon the whole of what hath been said in these Respects. Thus far by way of Answer to Mr. *Sedgwicks* and Mr. *Roberts* his Arguments.

SECT. X.

BUT whereas we have Asserted that the Covenant which God made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, was as much a Covenant of Works as that made with our first Parent. We are told 'That 'the Covenant of Works made with *Adam* in the state of Innocency, when he was able to have kept it, was never Revived or 'Renewed after the fall to the same *Intent* and *Purpose* it was 'first made with him, that is, to Obtain Life and Righteousness 'by Personal Obedience to it: For had God Promulged the first 'Covenant again at *Sinai* to the same use and Purpose it was first 'made with *Adam*; then in Establishing this he had utterly subverted the New Covenant, *Gal.* 3. 21. Life and Salvation was 'not then its end; that is, in it self, it neither was, nor could be 'given after the Fall for such a design and purpose. And therefore though it is Evident, that the *Sinai* Covenant, *Materially* 'Considered, is the same with *Adams* Covenant; yet *Intentionally* it is vastly different.

§. 2. To this we Reply, That it is indeed too Evident fairly to be denied, but that the Law given from Mount *Sinai*, was *a Covenant of Works*; Since your selves cannot but acknowledge that *Materially* Considered it is the same with *Adams Covenant*: But then (say you) *Intentionally* it is vastly different. But how doth that Appear? For though 'tis true God never *designed*, or *Intended* that any should obtain Life and Righteousne's by their Personal Obedience to it; yet even in *this Respect* also it was as much a *Covenant of Works*, as that made with our first Parent: For God never *intended* that *Adam* himself should obtain Life and

and Righteousneſs by his Obedience to that Covenant: For if he had, the purpoſe or *intention* of God in that reſpect, muſt of neceſſity have been accompliſhed: And accordingly *Adam* ſhould have ſtood, and Life and Righteouſneſs ſhould that way have been derived unto him; and not only unto him, but unto all his Offſpring alſo. But it is evident, that *Man that was in Honour, abode not*, but fell, and we all in him; and accordingly a New Covenant takes place, whereby Life and Righteouſneſs was to be derived, both unto him, and all his Elect Offſpring.

§. 3. So that if that Covenant at *Sinai* was materially a Covenant of Works, though God intended not, that Life ſhould be that way derived unto us; ſo it was in reſpect of *Adam*'s Covenant alſo. For as in the Legal Covenant, God doth now plainly tell ſinners, *That the Man that doth theſe things, ſhall live by them:* that is, if you can perform a ſtrict, perfect Obedience, Life and Salvation ſhall be your Reward; thus, and no otherwiſe was our firſt Parent himſelf dealt withal. For this was all the ſtipulation, or agreement that we find God made with him: Gen. 2. 16. *The Lord God commanded the man, ſaying, of every Tree of the Garden, thou maiſt freely eat: But of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou ſhalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die.* Carrying with it an implicite, *conditional* Promiſe; that if he forbore it, both Himſelf, and Poſterity ſhould live. For God, never, that we can find, made any *abſolute* Promiſe of Life to him; only implicit, and *conditional*. And ſince it cannot, with any ſhadow of truth, be affirmed, that God ever made any *abſolute Promiſe* of this nature unto him: Neither therefore can it be juſtly affirmed, that God ever *intended*, that Life and Righteouſneſs ſhould be conveyed into him by his Obedience unto that Covenant. Nay, rather it is clear, that God foreſaw he would fall; and conſequently *deſigned* that Life and Righteouſneſs *ſhould not* that way be derived unto Him, or to any of his Offſpring. From whence it plainly follows, the *Sinai* Covenant, was as much a Covenant of Works, as that made with our firſt Parent; not only ſince it is materially the ſame, but in this reſpect, intentionally alſo.

SECT. XI.

BUt whereas it is further objected; 'That if God never since 'the Fall published the Covenant of Works, with a design 'to justifie any man by it; and yet in the *Sinai* Covenant hath 'given it (materially Considered) a Second Edition, and Pro-'mulgation: It must needs follow, that it was done in *Subservi-'ency* to Christ, and the Covenant of Grace; or done in vain, as 'to the Elect. To set it forth in *opposition* to the Covenant of 'Grace, can never be imagined. To make it a *Co-ordinate* way of 'Salvation with Christ, is proved impossible. Therefore it must 'be *subordinate*, or not at all; there being nothing else left us. 'And this, (say they) the Scriptures fully assert and confirm; 'Rom. 10. 4. *Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness, to 'every one that believeth.* Are the End and Means contrariant? 'Or must not the means be always subordinate to the end? This 'is plain and clear Reasoning, not easily Answered. So Gal. '3. 24. *The Law was our Schoolmaster* to bring us to *Christ*; that 'is, to bring us to a Conviction of his Necessity; as it did *Paul*, 'Rom. 7. after Christ was come, and thousands more since *Paul*. 'Again, Gal. 3. 23. *It shut us up* to Christ, or Faith, as our on-'ly Remedy. This was, and still is its use and design, and will be 'so to the end, to all that come to Christ. As to others it hath 'another end; even to Judge and Condemn them that continue 'under it, as a Covenant of Works; *Rom.* 2. 12. But to Belie-'vers, it is subservient to Christ; both to bring them to him at 'first, and regulate their Lives, as a Moral Rule ever after. And 'therefore the two Tables are put into the Ark, *Heb.* 9. 4. to 'shew their subserviencie to him, and in this sense, its consistence 'with him.

§. 2. For Answer whereunto, We do indeed acknowledge the *subserviencie* of the Law to Christ, and the Covenant of Grace; in which respect it is also true, That the Means is not Contrariant to the End, but is always subordinate thereunto. But it doth not therefore follow, that *the Law is a Covenant of Gospel-Grace*, (for that is the only Point we are Contending about, or Enquiring after.) It hath indeed a plain subserviencie, or subordination thereunto; as *Hagar* the type of the Bondage Covenant, had unto *Sarah* the type of the Gospel Covenant. But yet neither is

the

the Handmaid the Mistres, nor the Mistres the Handmaid. These two are it'll distinct. The Law is not the Gospel, nor the Gospel the Law. And therefore, though the one of them is plainly subservient to the other, yet they ought not to be mixed, blended, or confounded the one with the other, as if they were but one and the same Covenant, and no difference to be made between them; only in respect of the Different Degrees of the Discovery of Gospel Grace, as hath been suggested.

§. 3. 'Tis true, the Law is appointed as *our School-master to Christ*, (for so the words run in the Original Text, as your selves have acknowledged;) that is, to shew us the Nature of Sin; together with the Holiness, and Righteousness of God's Nature and Being; to Convince us of our Sin and Misery without Christ, and our Necessity therefore of a Saviour. And in all these respects, it hath indeed a plain *subserviency* to drive us to Christ; and to induce us to fly with the more earnestness to lay hold upon *New-Covenant-Grace*, wherein Christ is plainly exhibited unto us for our Relief. But then it doth not therefore follow, that the Law it self is *subservientely a Covenant of Gospel-Grace*; or that it is such for the *substance* of it; as both Mr. *Sedgwick*, Mr. *Roberts*, and many other worthy Divines, affirm it is. A subserviency in any thing to promote the Ends of something else, doth not make it to be the thing it self; the Ends whereof are promoted thereby. The temptations of Satan, and the persecutions of Wicked Men, have a plain *subserviency*, (and that by God's own appointment, through his Over-ruling Providence) to promote the Ends of the Covenant of Grace; and to make us fly the more earnestly thereunto for Succour; yet it would be too absurd to affirm, that either of these are the Covenant of Grace; or subservientely such. So it is in our present Case: For though the Law is in it self *against us, and contrary to us*, as being *a Ministration of Death and Condemnation*, (as the Apostle witnesses it is) in which respect the Legal Covenant is directly opposite to the Gospel-Covenant, (as in our 23d Argument following, is more plainly and particularly demonstrated,) yet through the over-ruling Grace and Mercy of God; the Law with all its thundring Curses, and Menacies upon every Transgression and Disobedience; instead of *destroying us*, it is converted to a notable *subserviency* toward our Everlasting Comfort, by forcing us with the more speed to Christ, and the Covenant of Grace for Relief and Succour: So as that *out of the Eater, comes Meat*; *and out of the strong, Sweetness*. But shall we say therefore, that the Law it self is a Covenant of Gospel-Grace,

(which is constantly in the Scripture represented upto us as quite another thing) because it hath a subserviency to drive us thither for shelter.

§. 4. So that to allow, that there is indeed a subserviency in the Law to drive us to Jesus Christ, and the Covenant of Grace for Succour; and yet to deny, that the Law it self is therefore a *Covenant of Grace*, is Harmonious enough, and implies no Contradiction at all; (as it hath been suggested it doth) for as much as it is impossible, (and therefore it must rather of necessity be a plain contradiction on the other hand to affirm) that any thing can be subservient to the Ends of another; and at the same time, to be the same thing it self, which it is thus subservient unto: For if it be the same, how is it subservient to something else, as to another? The Law therefore being a Distinct Covenant from the Gospel; it must of necessity be a *Covenant of Works*, unless we shall say, there are two Covenants of Gospel-Grace; the one perfect, the other faulty; the one to endure for ever, the other to be Repealed, and Blotted out, as being against us, and contrary to us; a Ministration of Death and Condemnation, (as the Legal Covenant hath been proved to be) which in any sence, can never be applied to the Covenant of Grace, according to the Scripture Dialect.

§. 5. It is certain therefore (as hath been before hinted) that the Law shuts us up to Christ, or Faith, as our only Remedy; and indeed this was, and still is its use and design; and will be so to the end, to all that come to Christ; that is, it precludes, or shuts us up from all other ways and Expectations of Comfort; by shewing us our utter incapacity, to attain unto Life, by our own Righteousness; and therefore forces us, if ever we will be saved, to have recourse to the only Remedy. Accordingly the two Tables were put into the Ark, *Heb.* 9. 4. to shew their subserviency to Christ; and in this sense, its consistence with him; typically demonstrating, that though the Covenant of Works could not be kept, or performed by us; yet it should be perfectly fulfilled in Christ for us: In which respect he is said to be the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth. But then it doth not therefore follow, that the Law, that thus shuts us up, is the Remedy it self; or that the School-masters-Rod, that drives us to Christ, is Christ himself, or the Covenant of Grace it self; since the Means cannot be the End; nor the end the Means; though the Means is indeed subservient, or subordinate thereunto.

SECT. XII.

SECT. XII.

BUT then we are also told, 'That the Intention and Design of God, in the Promulgation of the Law at *Sinai*, was fatally mistaken by the Jews, and perverted to a quite contrary end; namely, to obtain Righteousness by their own Works of Obedience to it; and so to slight and oppose the Righteousness of Christ; not considering, that *Christ was the end, or scope of the Law for Righteousness, to every one that believeth*: Nor that the Law was their *School-master*, to convince them of Sin, and Impotency; and so drive them to Christ their only Remedy. Now this mistake of God's Intention in giving the Law, is the true Reason and Ground of those Seeming Contradictions, which we find in the New-Testament. For when the Apostle speaks of the Law, according to the true end and use of it, which God designed it for; then he magnifies the Law, and calls it *Holy, Just, and Good; a Spiritual Law, a Good Law: Our School-master to Christ*, tells us, that *Christ is the end of it for Righteousness to every one that believeth*: With many more high Encomiums of its Excellency and Usefulness. But when he considers it, as perverted by men; and reduced again to its Primitive Intention, to give Life and Righteousness by our Obedience to it; then he as much decries, and thunders against it; calling it *a Ministration of Death and Condemnation; a weak and beggarly thing*; with many other Notes of Disparagement. Nor can it be enough decried, when instead of *Subordination*, it's put in *Competition*; yea, in *Opposition* to Christ. And that this is no Fiction, or Groundless Distinction, which Obscures and Confounds Law and Gospel; appears not only by the Impossibility of Reconciling the Apostle with himself, but by this means: As also, by that plain Text in which it is grounded, Rom. 10. 3, 4. And 1 Tim. 1. 8. *The Law is good, if a Man use it lawfully*: That is, 'tis good or bad, according to the use men make of it. If they take it according to those Excellent Ends, for which God Promulged it, *viz.* to prepare them by Convictions for Christ: And afterward, when in him, as a moral Rule of Duty and Obedience; then it is Good and Excellent: But if it be made the Ground and Matter of our Righteousness, and so set in opposition to Christ; then nothing more fatal and pernitious. So that this Distinction

is

'is the Apostles own Distinction, given us as a Key, to open this 'Controversie by.

§. 2. *Reply.* But can we indeed think that when the Apostle thunders, as he doth against the Law; Calling it *a Ministration of Death and Condemnation*; *a weak and beggarly thing*; *that which was against us, contrary to us*; *and that which is therefore now blotted out, and taken out of the way*; *being nailed to the Cross of Christ*, &c. That he utters and declares all this, only because men had perverted the Law, and reduced it (as they thought) to its Primitive Intention, to give Life and Righteousness by their Obedience to it? 'Tis true, the Jews did plainly pervert, and misunderstood God's Design and Intention, in giving the Law as a Covenant of Works unto them; which was not, that any Person whatsoever, should ever attain unto Life and Righteousness thereby; but only to Convince them of their Necessity of a Saviour. But doth it therefore follow, that all those thundring Expressions, before mentioned, concerning the Law, were uttered by the Apostle, only because the Jews had *perverted it*? Doth not *Moses* himself call it *a Fiery Law, that proceeded from God's right Hand*, Deut. 33. 2. And doth not God himself pronounce *a Curse upon every one that continueth not in all things therein contained, to do them*, Deut. 27. 26 Gal. 3. 10. And is it not as plain, that from hence, even that from hence it is, that the Apostle calls it as he doth, *a Ministration of Death and Condemnation*: *Against us, and Contrary to us*, &c. Besides, it ought to be duly considered, that the Gospel and Covenant of Grace it self, was liable to as great an abuse as the Law, by being turned into Lasciviousness; as the Scriptures tells us it was; and yet the Apostle never thunders against the Gospel, as he doth against the Law, because Men had abused it. 'Tis true, he tells us concerning the Gospel; that *to some it is the savour of death, unto death, to others it is the savour of life, unto life*; that is, to those that *Reject it*, it is the savour of death unto death; to those that *Receive it*, it is the savour of life, unto life. But this is vastly different from the character he gives of the Law: For (saith he) *By the deeds of the Law, there shall no Flesh be justified in his sight*, Rom. 3. 20. And therefore, whether it is Received or Rejected, it is, as the Apostle calls it, *a Ministration of Death*, &c. Whereas the Gospel is such, only to those that Reject it, and do not give a saving entertainment to it. So that the Distinction we now oppose, is altogether without Scripture Warrant; and is indeed no other, than to impute unfaithfulness to *Paul*, and *Moses* also, in de-

declaring the Nature of the Law as they do. And accordingly hence we have just reason to conclude, that the Law was never instituted as a Covenant of Faith, , or as a Covenant of Grace, that hath such Epethites fixed thereon by the Spirit of God himself.

§. 3. 'Tis true, as you say, *the Law was our School-master to Christ*; to Convince us of our Necessity of him. And Christ is also said to be *the end of the Law, for Righteousness, to every one that believeth*; that is, he was the *accomplishment* thereof: he having perfectly fulfilled its Commands, submitted to its Curse, and answered its Penalty on our behalf; whereby it received the Greatest Honour that could be given it; a greater by far, than ever could be given it by us, in our own persons. *For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak, through the Flesh; God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful Flesh, and for sin, (or by a Sacrifice for Sin) condemned Sin in the Flesh: that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us*; that is, in the Person of our Surety for us, *Rom.* 8. 3, 4. But then it is so far from being true, that the Law was therefore a *Covenant of Faith*; that it is so much the more Convincingly Evident, that it was no other than a *Covenant of Works*: For as much as it is plain, that, as such, *Christ* himself submitted thereunto on our account. And it is as plain, that, as such, it would else have lighted on us, in our *own Persons*, in the Execution of its most dreadful Curses and Threatnings. But if we will rather have the sense of the words to be, as you suggest it is, that Christ *was the End* [or Scope] *of the Law for Righteousness, to every one that believeth*; that is, that it was God's design, thereby to drive them to Christ, their only Remedy, by Convincing them of their Necessity of him; It still comes to the same Reckoning: For though 'tis true, there is a plain *subserviency* in the Law, towards the promoting of the Designs of the *Covenant of Grace*; yet (as we have already seen) it no way follows, that the Law is therefore the Covenant of Grace it self; or the Handmaid the Mistress her self: For (saith the Apostle, Gal. 4. 24, 25, 26.) *These are the two Covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to Bondage, and is in Bondage with her Children: The other Answereth to* Jerusalem *that is above; which is free, and is the Mother of us all.* And if these were the *two Covenants*, and those two *essentially* different the one from the other, in the nature and tendency of either; as it is plain by the Apostles scope they are; so they must be kept. Two they were, and two they still remain to be; so as what the one is, the other is not. *Hagar* had indeed

deed a plain *subserviency* to *Sarah*: But yet as were the Typel, so are the Antitypes themselves; *Essentially* different; so as that the Bondage Covenant, can with no more Sense, nor Justice be called a Covenant of Faith, because it hath a *subserviency thereunto*, than the Covenant of Faith can with any shadow of pretence be called a Covenant of Bondage.

§. 4. Besides, when the Apostle speaks of the two Covenants, *these were the two Covenants*; the one from Mount *Sinai* meaning the Legal; the other the Gospel Covenant. He doth sufficiently Intimate, that there were never but two General Covenants made with Mankind, in all; that is, the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace. And if so, then if there were any such thing as a Covenant of Works made with our first Parent before the Fall (as we all affirm there was) it must of necessity be Included in the *Sinai* Covenant; And that both *Materially* Considered, and *Intentionally* also: Else there were three Covenants; and those *Specifically* different each from other; whereas the Apostle tells us but of two. To say it was Included in the Gospel Covenant is wholly Absurd; Therefore it must of necessity be Included in the *Sinai* Covenant; so as that both together make up that *first or old Covenant*, which the Scripture speaks of. For when the Apostle, *Heb.* 8. calls the *Sinai* Covenant by the Name of *the first or Old Covenant* (as he there doth several times over) it cannot possibly be understood that it was therefore the first Covenant that God ever made with Men *in respect of time*; for there had been an *Express Covenant* made with *Abraham*, and with *Noah* also, long before; And we also acknowledge that there was an *Implicite Covenant of Works* made with our first Parent, upon his first Creation besides the *Promise of Grace* that followed soon after the Fall. Therefore the *Sinai* Covenant must of necessity be called *the first or old Covenant*, because of its Congruity, Harmony, and Identity, with the Covenant of Works made with our first Parent; And that both in respect of the *matter*, and *Intention* thereof also: Or else it could never with any Propriety, or fitness of Expression, be called *the first* or *old Covenant*, as by the Apostle divers times over it is, in the fore-mentioned 8*th* to the *Hebrews*.

§. 5. The Law therefore could not possibly be a Covenant of Gospel Grace; (as by many the most Learned and Worthy Divines, and it may be the far greater part (of Moderns at least) it hath been confidently affirmed to be) For (as we have before acknow-

acknowledged ;) though there was never any Covenant that God ever made with Men ; but hath more or less of *Grace* therein ; Since it is an Infinite Condescention in God, that he will have to do with Men at any Rate ; yet that the Covenant from Mount *Sinai*, was in any Sense ; or is by vertue of any proper Scripture Distinction, to be understood as *a Covenant of Gospel Grace ; whereof Christ alone is the Mediator* ; This is that which for all those forementioned Reasons, we utterly deny. And this is the Point, the onely Point, which in the beginning of this Discourse we undertook to disprove ; And that as being of no small Consequence to the Church of God. For upon this Hypothesis, or Supposition ; *That the Covenant at* Sinai *was indeed a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant* (for any other Notion of it will not serve the turn) *and consequently that the Covenant of Circumcision made with* Abraham Gen. 17. 7. 8. 9. *is of the same Nature* ; the greatest part of the most plausible Arguments for the support of Infants Baptism, are founded. But if we have, or can substantially prove, that neither of these forementioned Covenants were *Gospel Covenants* ; no wonder if we make an Answerable Improvement thereof in its proper place, by way of opposition to the forementioned Practice.

§. 62. As for the Scripture before alledged, 1 Tim. 1. 8. *We know that the Law is good if a Man use it Lawfully*. It is indeed highly observable : For as much as there is a *Lawful* as well as an *unlawful* use that Men may make thereof ; that is, if we make use of it as the *Rule of our Obedience*, then we make that Right, Just, Proper, and *Lawful* use thereof, which God requires. For we know that in this Respect we are still *under the Law to Christ*. And in this Respect it is true enough, as the Apostle tells us, that *the Law is Holy, Just and Good* : For there is therein a Spiritual Discovery of the Holiness and Righteousness of Gods Nature and Being ; whose Image must be Ingraven upon us, if ever we arrive unto true Blessedness. But if we Preach it up, or endeavour to Establish it, as a *Covenant of Life* ; or as a *Covenant of Faith*, and *Grace* (which are Equipollent terms ; let us distinguish as we please, between a Covenant of Grace Absolutely, and subserviently such) and consequently are *desirous* in that Respect to be *under it* (as the Apostle tells the *Galatians*, and which we cannot avoid if we reckon it to be a Covenant of Grace) then, according to the Apostles plain Scope, in the whole Epistles to the *Romans* and *Gallations* ; instead of *using it lawfully*, we make an *unlawful use* thereof, by perverting it to such

such a service as God never Intended it for; And are guilty of mingling Law and Gospel together: Life and Death; and as we have said before; a Ministration of Condemnation, with that of Righteousness and Peace, which would be no other than to overthrow both the Law and Gospel. And this is the Apostles own Distinction, given us as a Key to open this Controversie by, Gal. 1. 6, 7.

SECT. XIII.

BUT whereas it is yet further Objected; 'That, after this 'Rate, both *Moses* and *Abraham*, and all the Old Testament Saints, were under two contrary Covenants, at one and 'the same time, from whence many Absurdities do follow. As to this, we dare not Impeach or Controle Infinite Wisdom. We have onely declared plain matter of Fact; so far as the Scriptures themselves do inform us: For therein it is Evident (as hath been already proved) that both *Moses* and the whole Body of that People of *Israel* in the Wilderness, were under the forementioned Covenant from Mount *Sinai*; and that expressly as the Covenant which the Lord Commanded them to perform, *Deut.* 4. 13. And that under the severest Penalties of a dreadful Curse, upon *every one that Confirmed not all the Words of this Law to do them*, unto which *all the People were to say Amen*, Deut. 27. 26. This Covenant therefore they were absolutely under, as being expressly made both with *Moses*, and the whole Body of the Children of *Israel*, without Exception of any, *Exod.* 34. 27. which we have already argued at large, could be no other than a Covenant of Works; *A Ministration of Death and Condemnation*; *A hand writing of Ordinances that was against us, contrary to us*; And therefore now *Blotted out, and taken out of the way, being Nailed to the Cross of Christ*. When yet it is also as Evident from the same Holy Scriptures of Truth; That at the same time; both *Moses*, and all the Elect among that People, were under a pure Covenant of Gospel Grace, as we have already proved; when the Lord told *Moses* that *he had found Grace in his Sight*; and that he *knew him by Name*; and would *make all his Goodness to pass before him*; and would Proclaim the Name of the Lord before him: Saying, *I will be Gracious to whom I will be Gracious*; *And I will shew Mercy to whom I will shew Mercy*: And when accordingly, *the Lord descended in the Cloud*; *and stood with*

Moses

Moses there; And Proclaimed the Name of the Lord: The Lord God Merciful and Gracious, Long-suffering, and Abundant in Goodness and in Truth; keeping Mercy for Thousands, forgiving Iniquity, Transgression and Sin. Now we have already proved that these were two Distinct Covenants; The one made with Moses, and the whole Body of that People; The other with Christ, and those that were Elected among them onely. And if these were two contrary Covenants, and in themselves, just opposite, the one unto the other of them (as indeed they were) we have nothing to say, but to Conclude with the Apostle in another case concerning the Call of the Gentiles, and Rejection of the Jews, that were once Gods onely Beloved People, to whom pertained the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the Service of God, and the Promises; O the depth of the Riches both of the Wisdom and Knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his Judgments, and his Ways past finding out! Rom. 11. 33, 34.

6. 2. However, though 'tis true, New Testament Saints are absolutely freed from the Law as a Covenant of Works by the Sacrifice of Christ; yet it is Evident, that during the time into appointed by the Father; those before were under the Power and Tyranny thereof, notwithstanding those Discoveries of Gospel Grace that were otherwise Revealed unto them. To this purpose the Apostle tells us Expressly, Gal. 3. 23. &c. Before Faith came, we (saith he, that is, we Jews, not we Gentiles, for these passages agree not with the Gentiles at all, but we Jews) were kept under the Law, shut up unto the Faith which should afterward be revealed; even as he had said before; The Law was added because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made. Wherefore the Law was our School-master to Christ, that we might be Justified by Faith: But after that Faith is come, we are no longer under a School-master. So again Chap. 4. 1, 2, 3, &c. Now I say that the Heir, as long as he was a Child, differeth nothing from a Servant, though he be Lord of all: But is under Tutors, and Governours, until the time appointed of the Father; Even so we, when we were Children were in Bondage, under the Elements of the World: But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law, to Redeem them that were under the Law, that we might Receive the Adoption of Sons. So that upon the whole, it is plain matter of Fact, evident and undeniable (Resolve we the Mystery thereof how we will) That the Jews, even the whole Body

Body of that People, without exception of any, were for the time appointed of the Father, under the Dominion and Tyranny of the Law; not that as a Covenant of Works, or a Bondage Covenant; when yet it is equally as evident, that at the same time, all the Elect among them, were under a Covenant of pure Gospel Grace, whereby they were saved.

§. 3. Wherefore we must grant, that God's People were then under *two distinct*, or *essencially different Covenants*? We say, we must do so; provided always, that the way of *Reconciliation, and Salvation*, was the same under both. But it will be said, and with great pretence of Reason, (for it is that which is the sole Foundation they all build upon, who affirm the Legal and the Gospel Covenants, to be only a *twofold Administration* of the same Covenant) That this being the Principal End of a Divine Covenant, If the *way of Reconciliation* and Salvation be *the same under both*, then indeed they are for the *Substance* of them but one: And we grant, that this would inevitably follow, if it were so equally *by vertue* of them both. If *Reconciliation, and Salvation by Christ*, were to be obtained, not only *under the Old Covenant*, but *by vertue thereof*, then it must be the same for Substance with the New. But this is not so; For no Reconciliation with God, nor Salvation, could ever be obtained *by vertue of the Old Covenant*, or the Administration of it. *For by the Deeds of the Law, there shall no Flesh be justified in his sight*, (as our Apostle disputes at large, *Rom.* 3. 20. &c.) though all Believers were Reconciled, Justified and Saved, by vertue of the *Promise*, whilst they were *under the Covenant*.

§. 4. And how absurd soever it may seem to be, to affirm, that God's People were under two Contrary Covenants, at one and the same time; yet, as we see the Scriptures do plainly assure us they were; so it is evident, that the absurdity is by far the greater, on the other hand, to affirm that the *Sinai* Covenant was purposely so dispensed, as to tender Life and Happiness upon two Opposite, and quite Contrary Conditions, *viz.* Works, and Faith: Perfect Doing, and Believing, as if *the same Foundation*, *could at the same time yield forth bitter waters and sweet*. Which absurdity, all those must of necessity run into, that affirm the *Sinai* Covenant to be a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus: As hath been already shewn.

SECT. XIV.

SECT. XIV.

AND here we ſhould have drawn up the ſum of what hath been already offered on the preſent Subject; but that there are four Arguments yet behind, pretending to prove, that the *Sinai* Covenant, and that made with *Adam* in Paradiſe, were not the ſame, but widely different Covenants; which remain therefore to be Anſwered. Only by the way it muſt be remembred, that two Arguments to the ſame purpoſe, have already been diſpatcht. The Firſt was, That though the *Sinai Covenant*, *materially* Conſidered, is the ſame with *Adams*; yet *intentionally*, it is vaſtly different. The Second was; That the *Sinai Covenant* had a *Mediator*, which *Adams* wanted. Both which, we hope, have been Satisfactorily Anſwered, in the foregoing parts of this Diſcourſe. It remains therefore, that we proceed to the Conſideration of thoſe that follow; The firſt whereof runs thus;

Arg. 1. *Thoſe Covenants that differ in the* Subjects, *or* Parties *with whom they are made, are not the ſame, but different Covenants: But ſo doth that at* Sinai, *and that in Paradiſe. The Covenant made with* Adam, *was made with* Innocent *and* Perfect Man, *able to keep it; This with* Lapſed, Sinful Man, *utterly diſabled to keep any one Precept of it.*

Reply. To which we Reply; That the difference betwixt the *Subjects*, makes no alteration in the *Subſtance*, or *Eſſence* of the Covenants; Eſpecially ſince we have already, by ſeveral Arguments ſubſtantially proved; not only that they were *Materially* the ſame (which your ſelves cannot but acknowledge) but *intentionally* alſo. And forasmuch as 'tis undeniable, That God hath not forfeited or loſt his Right of Sovereignty, or Dominion over us, though we have forfeited and loſt our ſtrength and capacity of Obedience; the Covenants in queſtion therefore may very well be the ſame, notwithſtanding the difference betwixt their Subjects.

Arg. 2. *Tooſe Covenants that vaſtly differ in their* Dedication; *are not the ſame but divers: But ſo doth the Covenants with* Iſrael, *and with* Adam. *The Covenant with* Adam *taught no way of the Expiation of Sins by the Dedication of it; ſo did that with* Moſes, Exod. 24. 8. *And* Moſes *took the Blood, and ſprinkled it on the People, and ſaid; Behold, this is the Blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you, concerning all theſe words.*

Reply: To this we Reply; That it hath been already proved, That though the *Ceremonial Covenant*, was indeed dedicated with Blood, and Sprinkling; yet the *Law written in Stones* was not. So that if *Adam's* Covenant wanted Confirmation, or Dedication with Blood, shewing the Remission of Sins; so did that written in Stones also: And therefore in this respect there is no difference at all betwixt them. True it is, that the Ceremonial Covenant was so dedicated; in which respect there is a plain difference betwixt that, and the Covenant made with *Adam*. But this alters not the Case; For it is evident, that the Law written in Stones, was not so dedicated; and that is enough to prove what we have all along asserted; *That the Covenant of Works made with our First Parent, was renewed to that People in the Wilderness.* And though 'tis true, the Ceremonial Covenant being dedicated as it was, did point unto Christ, and the way of Salvation by him; yet nevertheless, it hath been already proved, that it was a Covenant of Works, as well as that written in Stones; and therefore both of them now Repealed, to make way for the *New Covenant, which was established upon better Promises.* And it having been proved, that they were both, no other than two several Editions of the same Covenant of Works; and that neither of them can, with any shadow of Truth or Justice, be stiled *a Covenant of Grace, or a Gospel Covenant* (which cannot be affirmed without contradicting the whole Scope of the Scriptures) it sufficiently serves the design we level at; whether there be a *Perfect Identity* in every Circumstance between either of these, and *Adam's* Covenant or no. For as Dr. *Owen* well observes; Whatever variations may be made 'in, or Additions unto the Dispensation of the First Covenant, so 'long as this Rule is retained, *Do this and Live*; it is still the 'same Covenant for the *Substance*, and *Essence* of it.

Arg. 3. *Those Covenants which vastly differ in the Priviledges contained in them, are not just the same, but far different Covenants: But so doth the Covenant with* Adam, *and that with* Israel *differ. In* Adam's *Covenant no Pardon was admitted or accepted upon Repentance: But so it is in* Moses *Covenant; God proclaimed himself at the Promulgation of it, a Sin Pardoning God,* Exod. 34. *And promiseth Pardon on Repentance for the Breach of it;* Lev. 26. *from* vers. 40. *to* vers. 46. *If you say this was the Covenant with* Abraham, *not with* Moses; *then* Abraham's *Covenant, was the Covenant of Grace: But see,* vers. 46. *and all is ended.*

Reply. The Answer we have returned to the foregoing Argument, may very well serve for this also. For if the *Sinai* Covenant,

nant, which was delivered by Gods own immediate Mouth and Voice; and which was also written with God's own Finger, upon the two Tables of Stone; was not dedicated with Blood and Sprinkling (which shewed Remission of Sins) as the Ceremonial Covenant was; then it plainly follows, that in this respect also, there is no difference between this and the Covenant made with *Adam*: For if in *Adams* Covenant, no Pardon of Sin was admitted or accepted upon Repentance, as wanting that which shewed the Expiation thereof; so it was in this. But whereas you say, that at the Promulgation of *Moses* Covenant, God proclaimed himself a Sin Pardoning God, *Exod.* 34. We freely acknowledge he did so; for else none had been saved. But then we have also proved, that the Covenant of Grace, there mentioned, was vastly distinct, and essencially different from that mentioned, *Exod.* 20. The one being made with *Moses*, and the Elect only; the other with the whole Body of the Congregation of *Israel*. And not only were they two distinct Covenants, in respect of their different Subjects; but in respect of their vastly different nature also: For though the Covenant or Promises mentioned in the 33d and 34th Chapters of *Exodus*, expressly declared God to be a Sin Pardoning God; A God *Merciful and Gracious, forgiving Iniquity, Transgression and Sin*; yet there is nothing that can be more evident than this, that the *other* discovered no such thing, but rather the contrary. 'The Jewish Legal Covenant (saith Dr. *Annesley*) neither admitted of Faith in the Redeemer, nor Repentance of Sin. 'For Pardon of Sin, and Curse for Sin, are inconsistent, Gal. 3. 10. '*As many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curse: For* 'it is written, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things* 'which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them. As 'many as depend upon the Works of the Law for Justification, 'are under the Curse, And the Law discovered no other way of 'Justification but by Works, *Morn. Exercise*, p. 122.

§. 2. But (say you) God promiseth Pardon, on Repentance, for the Breach of *Moses* Covenant, *Lev.* 26. 40, &c. And (say we) so he did in respect of *Adam's* Covenant; for otherwise we had all been undone for ever. But as *Adam's* Covenant promised no Pardon on Repentance, so neither did the *Jewish Legal Covenant*: For indeed it rather threatens, and inflicts the contrary, *viz.* a dreadful Curse upon every Transgression and Disobedience; and as the Doct. well observes, admits of no Repentance. For as it is evident, that the Law written in Stones, neither discovered, nor admits of any such thing: So as for the Ceremonial Co-

venant it self; the Apostle expresly tells us, *Heb.* 9. 9. that the Sacrifices thereof *could not make him, that did the Service perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience*; *For* (saith he, Chap. 10. 1, 4.) *the the Law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things, can never with those Sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the Comers thereunto perfect.* —— *For it is not possible, that the Blood of Bulls and of Goats, should take away Sins.* Other Covenants ('tis true) there were, wherein God plainly discovered the mercifulness of his nature in that respect: And among the rest, the Covenant made with *Abraham*; which in the forementioned *Lev.* 26. God doth plainly direct them to for their Relief. But (say you) if you say, This was the Covenant with *Abraham*, not with *Moses*; then *Abraham's* Covenant was the Covenant of Grace. But yet (say we) neither will this do the business you alledge it for: For having diligently examined, *Lev.* 26. 40, &c. We find recorded to this purpose; that in the latter days, after that the People of *Israel* should have been scattered into all Nations, and had all sorts of Plagues inflicted on them for their sins: *If* (saith God) *they shall confess their sins, and the iniquities of their Fathers*, &c. *Then will I remember my Covenant with* Jacob, *and also my Covenant with* Isaac, *and also my Covenant with* Abraham *will I Remember.* From whence, First, It may be plainly collected, that there was no Pardon to be expected by them, from the *Sinai Covenant*: For God doth not direct them to apply themselves thither for Relief; nor doth he in the least suggest, that that way any thing of Pardon could be justly expected by them: But he directs them rather to have recourse unto the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*; for that is the Covenant (saith God) that I will Remember. And Secondly, It ought also to be duly observed, that though the *Covenant of Circumcision*, which God made with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. was indeed of the same nature with the *Sinai Covenant* (as we have already proved;) yet it is evident, that God had long before the Covenant of Circumcision was in being, entred into a *Covenant of Grace*, or a Covenant that was truly *Evangelical*, with Believing *Abraham*, wherein God freely promised, That *in him*, that is, *in his Seed, all the Nations of the earth should be blessed*, Gen. 12. 2, 3. And accordingly, this is the Covenant that *Peter* directs the Bleeding Jews unto in his time, Act. 3. 25. *Ye are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers; saying unto* Abraham, *and in thy Seed shall all the Kindreds of the Earth be blessed.* Which free Gospel Promise doth plainly comprehend both

Jews,

Jews and *Gentiles*. And this therefore undoubtedly, is the Covenant that God tells them in *Leviticus*, he will Remember for the future Comfort of Diſtreſſed and diſperſed *Iſrael*: For as *Peter* refers the Jews thereunto and unto that alone, ſo this very Covenant, and that in theſe very terms, had not onely been made with *Abraham*, but as God here ſpeaks with *Iſaac*, *Gen.* 24. 4. and with *Jacob* alſo: *Gen.* 28. 14. Whereas the Covenant of Circumciſion had not been ſo Renewed or Repeated: And therefore this muſt be the onely Covenant that God here ſpeaks of. And whereas God tells them Verſ. 45. That *he would for their ſakes remember the Covenant of their Anceſtors, whom he brought forth out of the Land of Egypt.* This muſt of neceſſity have Reference either to the forementioned Covenant with *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*: Or the Promiſes mentioned *Exod.* 33. 34. And cannot poſſibly have any Reference to the *Sinai Covenant*: For that was a *Bondage Covenant*, Gal. 4. 21, 22, &c. *A Miniſtration of Death and Condemnation*, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 8, 9. *Againſt us and contrary to us*; And therefore now *Blotted out*, Col. 2. 14. And is accordingly by *Moſes* himſelf repreſented as *a fiery Law that Proceeded from Gods Right Hand*, Deut. 33. 2. So that that could not poſſibly yield any comfort unto them: Whereas the forementioned Covenants did plainly give them hopes of Relief and Pardon. But (ſay you) ſee *Verſ.* 46. and all is ended. We have therefore accordingly Examined that Text; But cannot diſcern that it ſpeaks any thing by way of oppoſition to what we have Aſſerted: For thus run the words. *Theſe are the Statutes and Judgments, and Laws which the Lord made between him, and the Children of* Iſrael *at Mount* Sinai, *by the Hand of Moſes*, which can have no other Senſe than this, That this being the laſt Verſe of the laſt Chapter (ſave one) of *Leviticus*, wherein the Statutes and Judgments, or the ſeveral branches of the Ceremonial Law had been particularly Rehearſed unto them: Theſe words in this 46*th Verſe* contains therefore onely the general Sum thereof; So that we cannot diſcern that it makes off or on as to the preſent Argument.

Arg. 4. The Fourth and laſt Argument runs thus; Thoſe Covenants which have Seals annexed of vaſtly different Nature, are not Abſolutely or juſt the ſame, but widely different Covenants; But ſo have theſe two Covenants; *Ergo*, not the ſame. The Tree of Life was the onely Sacrament Annext to the firſt; but the Paſſover and Circumciſion to the laſt: Both holding forth Chriſt and Salvation by him. The firſt a plain Type

of Christ in the Paschal Lamb. The other *a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith.*

Reply. First, as to what concerns the *Tree of Life*, which you say was the onely *Sacrament* annext to *Adams Covenant*; That it was either a *Sacrament* or a *Seal* annext to that Covenant, the Scripture gives us no Account thereof that we can find. And as for the *Passover* and *Circumcision*, which you make to be the *Seals* of the *Sinai Covenant*, the Scripture is as silent even in that Respect also. As for the *Passover*, it was indeed as you say, a plain *Type* of Christ, as many other things then were: But we do not find that it is ever called, a *Seal of the Sinai Covenant*; Nor do we find that Circumcision is ever called *the Seal* thereof. It is indeed called *a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith that* Abraham *had yet being uncircumcized*, Rom. 4. 11. But the same Apostle expressly tells us, *Gal.* 3. 12. That *the Law is not of Faith.* And if the Law is not of Faith, then neither can it be *a Covenant of Faith*; And then it doth also as plainly follow, that Circumcision, which is by the Apostle termed a Seal of the Righteousness of *Abrahams* Faith, could not be *the Seal thereof.* And in this Respect therefore it is highly observable; That though Circumcision is frequently called a *Token of the Covenant* mentioned. *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. to the generality that were under it; yet the Scripture no where tells us, That it was *a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*, but unto *Abraham* onely: For indeed none else had ever before or after their Circumcision, such a Faith that Entituled them to such Singular Promises, and Prerogatives as *Abraham* had. But of this we have already said so much, toward the Resolution of the present Point, in the Seventh Branch of our Answer to the Eleventh Objection, in the Second Part of this Discourse foregoing; and have yet so much to say in what follows, where we shall have a further occasion purposely to handle this Argument, that we shall need to say the less of it here.

SECT. XV.

FOR a Conclusion of the present Point, we shall onely Collect the sum of the foregoing Arguments already Insisted on; proving that the Legal Covenant was not a Covenant of Faith: But was indeed and in truth, no other than a Covenant of Works. For;

First,

First, That Covenant that is not of Faith, cannot possibly be a Covenant of Faith. But the Apostle doth expressly affirm, that, *the Law is not of Faith*, Gal. 3. 11, 12. Therefore neither can it be a Covenant of Faith.

Secondly, That Covenant which is now Repealed could not be a Covenant of Faith. But the Apostle doth plainly affirm, that the first Covenant for the faultiness thereof, is now Repealed, *Heb.* 8. 7, 13. 2 *Cor.* 3. 7, 11. *Col.* 2. 14. *Heb.* 7. 18. Therefore that Covenant could not be a Covenant of Faith.

Thirdly, That Covenant that could not give Life, could not be a Covenant of Faith: But the Law could not give Life, *Gal.* 3. 21. 22. Therefore it could not be a Covenant of Faith.

Fourthly, That Covenant that is opposed to the Covenant of Faith, as quite another thing, could not be a Covenant of Faith. But the School-mastership of the Law, is by the Apostle plainly opposed, and contradistinguished unto the Covenant of Faith, as quite another thing, *Gal.* 3. 23, 24, 25. Therefore it could not be a Covenant of Faith.

Fifthly, That Covenant, the Righteousness whereof is opposed to the Righteousness of Faith; cannot be a Covenant of Faith. But the Righteousness of the Law is plainly by the Apostle opposed to the Righteousness of Faith, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6, &c. Therefore it could not be a Covenant of Faith.

Sixthly. That Covenant that could never Justifie any that were under it, could never be a Covenant of Faith. *For being Justified by Faith, we have Peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 5. 1. But the Scripture doth expressly Testifie; That *by the Deeds of the Law, there shall no Flesh be Justified in his Sight*, Rom. 3. 20. Therefore that Covenant could never be a Covenant of Faith.

Seventhly, That Covenant under which, though many were Justified; yet none were ever Justified *by it*, or *by vertue* of it; could never be a Covenant of Faith. But such is the Nature of the Law, that though many were Justified under it; yet none were ever Justified by it, or by Vertue of it, *Rom.* 3. 20. Therefore that Covenant could never be a Covenant of Faith.

Eighthly, That Covenant that saith, *Do this and Live*; Or that *the Man that doth these things shall Live by them*; cannot possibly be a Covenant of Gospel-Grace, but of Works: Since the Apostle Informs us, That *to him that worketh is the Reward reckoned, not of Grace but of Debt*, Rom. 4. 4. But the same Apostle doth expressly tell us; That *Moses describeth the Righteousness of the Law, that the Man which doth these things*

shall live by them, Rom. 10. 5. Therefore that Covenant could be no other than a Covenant of Works.

Ninthly, That Covenant that is plainly and in direct terms opposed unto Grace, cannot be a Covenant of Grace. But the Law is by the Apostle directly opposed unto Grace. *Rom.* 6. 14. *Sin shall not have Dominion over you: For ye are not under the Law, but under Grace.* Therefore that Covenant could never be a Covenant of Grace.

Tenthly, That Covenant that was not onely by the *Jews* Estimated as a Covenant of Works, but was so by Gods own Appointment, must needs be a Covenant of Works. But the Law was not onely by the *Jews* so Reckoned, but by Gods own Appointment it was expresly so designed, *Lev.* 18. 4, 5. *Deut:* 27. 26. *Rom.* 10. 5. *Gal.* 3. 10, 12. Therefore that Covenant must needs be a Covenant of Works.

Eleventhly, That Covenant through which *Abrahams* Inheritance was not derived, could not be a Covenant of Faith but of Works. But the Apostle doth expresly tell us, *That if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise: But God gave it to* Abraham *by Promise*, Gal. 3. 18. Therefore the Law could not possibly be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works.

Twelfthly, That Covenant through which had the Inheritance been conveyed, would have made void Faith, and made the Promise of none effect, could not possibly be a Covenant of Faith. But the Apostle doth expresly tell us; That *if they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none effect*, Rom. 4. 14. Therefore the Law could not possibly be a Covenant of Faith,

Thirteenthly, That Covenant from the Curse whereof, we were Redeemed by Christ, could not be a Covenant of Grace, but of Works. But the Apostle Informs us; That *Christ hath Redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, himself being made a Curse for us*, Gal. 3. 13. chap. 4. 4, 5. Therefore the Law could not be a Covenant of Grace but of Works.

Fourteenthly, That Covenant that is set forth by the Apostle as a Ministration of Death, and Condemnation, could be no other than a Covenant of Works. But the Apostle doth assure us, that the Law Written in Stones was *a Ministration of Death and Condemnation*, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 9. Therefore it could be no other than a Covenant of Works,

Fifteenthly, That Covenant in which was the Hand writing of Ordinances contained, was *against us, and contrary to us*, which is therefore now *Blotted out, and taken out of the way, being Nailed*

to

to the Cross of Christ; could be no other than a Covenant of Works. But such is the Nature of the Law, *Col.* 2. 14. 2 *Cor.* 3. 6, 7, 8, 9. Therefore it could be no other than a Covenant of Works.

Sixteenthly, That Covenant which when it comes, Revives Sin, and kills the Sinner; And which though it was Ordained to Life, is by Experience found to be unto Death, could not be a Covenant of Grace: But *Paul* doth expressly tell us; That *when the Commandment came, Sin Revived and he died. And the Commandment which was Ordained to Life, he found to be unto Death*, Rom. 7. 9, 10. Therefore that Covenant could not be a Covenant of Grace but of Works.

Seventeenthly, That Covenant that is a Bondage-Covenant, which gendereth to Bondage; all whose Children also are in Bondage, cannot possibly be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works. But the Apostle doth Expressly Inform us, that *Mount* Sinai *Covenant is a Bondage Covenant*, that it *gendereth to Bondage*, and that *her Children* also *are in Bondage*, Gal. 4. 21, 22, 23, 24, 26. Therefore Mount *Sinai* Covenant could be no other than a Covenant of Works.

Eighteenthly, That Covenant that admitted not of Faith in the Redeemer, nor Repentance of Sin: Since Pardon of Sin and Curse for Sin are Inconsistent; could not be a Covenant of Grace. But the Scripture doth expressly assure us; That *as many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curse: For it is Written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are Written in the Book of the Law to do them*, Gal. 3. 10. Therefore that Covenant could not possibly be a Covenant of Grace but of Works.

Nineteenthly, That Covenant that had not Christ for the Mediator of it, could never be a Covenant of Faith but of Works. But the Apostle speaking of the Legal Covenant made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, tells us; That *Christ hath obtained a more Excellent Ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was Established upon better Promises*, Heb. 8. 6, 7, 8. 9. From whence it plainly follows, that Christ was not the Mediator of the Legal Covenant. Therefore that Covenant could never be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works.

Twentiethly, That Covenant that was not Confirmed by the Blood of Christ (which alone can cleanse us from all unrighteous-

righteouſneſs) but onely by the Bloud of Bulls, and Goats, and Calves, and the Aſhes of an Heifer ſprinkling the unclean, which onely Sanctified to the Purifying of the Fleſh, and could never take away Sins, nor make him that did the Service perfect as pertaining to the Conſcience; could not be a Covenant of Faith. But the Ceremonial Law was of this Nature, and the Sacrifices thereof, wherewith alone it was Dedicated, *Heb.* 9. 9, 10. 11, 12, 13, 14. *Chap.* 10. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. Therefore that Covenant could not poſſibly be a Covenant of Faith but of Works.

Twenty firſt, That Covenant that was not confirmed by the Bloud of Chriſt; No, nor ſo much as by the Bloud of Bulls, or Goats, or Calves, which was plainly Typical thereof; could never be a Covenant of Grace but of Works. But the Law Written in Stones was ſo far from being confirmed by the Bloud of Chriſt, that it was never (that we read of) Dedicated with any other ſort of Bloud whatſoever. Therefore that Covenant could not poſſibly be a Covenant of Grace, but of Works.

Twenty ſecond, That Covenant that is Repreſented to us in the Scripture as a Fiery, Burning Law; the Proclamation alſo whereof was attended with dreadful Thunderings and Lightenings; with Blackneſs and Darkneſs, and Tempeſt; And ſuch a Voice of Words as could not be endured, which made *Moſes* himſelf exceedingly to quake and tremble, could not be a Covenant of Faith, but of Works. But ſuch was the Nature and Quality of the Legal Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, *Exod.* 20. 18, 19. *Deut.* 33. 2. *Heb.* 12. 18, 19, 20, 21. Therefore that Covenant could not be a Covenant of Faith but of Works.

Twenty third, That Covenant that is juſt oppoſite to the Goſpel Covenant; which the Scripture repreſents unto us as a Covenant of Peace and Liberty, making a Joyful ſound, and ſpeaking with a ſmall, ſtill, comfortable, and alluring Voice, in the Ears, and to the Hearts of Sinners; that hath alſo *Jeſus for the Mediator thereof*, and *ſpeaketh better things than the Bloud of* Abel; Proclaiming *the Lord, the Lord God, Gracious, and Merciful, Abundant in Goodneſs, and in Truth, forgiving Iniquity, Tranſgreſſion and Sin.* That Covenant can never be a Covenant of Grace, but of Works. But the Legal Covenant is plainly in Scripture oppoſed unto the Goſpel Covenant in all theſe Reſpects, *Heb.* 12. from the 18*th* to the 24*th* *Gal.* 3. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. *Gal.* 4. 21, &c. Therefore the Legal Covenant

venant could not possibly be a Covenant of Grace, but of Works.

§. So that notwithstanding all the most plausible Arguments, which are usually urged by way of opposition to what we have now Asserted (unless we must shut our Eyes) there can be nothing more plain than this: That the Law given by *Moses* to the Seed of *Abraham* at Mount *Sinai*, instead of being a Covenant of Faith in Christ Jesus, or a Covenant of Gospel Grace (as many Divines famous for Learning and Piety do confidently affirm it is) was no other than a Covenant of Works, and that which is therefore now done away, 2 *Cor.* 3. 7, 8, 9, 11. *Col.* 2. 14. *Heb.* 8. 7, 13. From whence it plainly and undeniably follows, that the Covenant of Circumcision, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. (which God there promised to Establish betwixt Himself, *Abraham* and his Seed after him in their Generations) being the same thing and of the same nature (as hath been already proved) is therefore now also Repealed and done away therewith, *Acts* 15. 10. *Gal.* 5. 3, 4, 5. *Col.* 2, 14. And consequently all the Arguments thence deduced, howsoever, or by whomsoever formed, for the support of Infants Baptism, do of themselves vanish.

THE

THE
FIFTH PART,

Containing a Deſcription of that truly Evangelical Covenant, God was pleaſed to make with Believing *Abraham*: Wherein lies the Sum of the Everlaſting Goſpel then Preached unto him; ſince Proclaimed by the Apoſtles, and which now remains to be yet further Publiſhed unto all Nations, for the Obedience of Faith, *Rom.* 16. 25, 26. *Rev.* 14. 6, 7.

Wherein the true Nature and Difference betwixt the two Covenants; that of Works, and that of Grace, is further Explained.

Rev. 11. 19. *And the Temple of God was opened in Heaven and there was ſeen in his Temple the Ark of his Teſtament; and there were Lightnings, and Voices, and Thundrings, and an Earth-quake, and Great Hail.*

SECT. I.

§. 1. BUT though the Covenant of Circumciſion, which God was pleaſed to make with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. was no other than a Covenant of Works, as the Covenant at *Sinai* was, and are both therefore now done away; yet (as we have already declared) it is evident and undeniable, that God was alſo pleaſed to enter into a Covenant

Covenant of Grace with Believing *Abraham*, even such a Covenant as was purely Evengelical, and that which never shall be abolished. And it is also as evident, that this Gospel Covenant had been Established and Preached unto *Abraham*, long before the Covenant of Circumcision was made with him: (For both *Abraham* and all true Believers, in that Age, were in the Covenant of Grace long before the Covenant of Circumcision was made, and would have been so, if that had never been) which Covenant of Grace or Gospel Covenant, which God was thus pleased to make with Believing *Abraham*, is indeed the great Charter, by which the Believing Gentiles always did, and do claim Heaven and Earth, and all the Promises they have title to. For in this respect it is, that the Apostle tells us as he doth, Gal. 3. 8. That *the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justifie the Heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel unto* Abraham, *saying; in thee shall all Nations be Blessed*; Which he quoteth not from *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. but from *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. Where before *Abraham*'s removal out of his own Country (and therefore long before the Covenant of Circumcision was in being) God enters into a solemn Covenant with *Abraham*, saying; *I will make of thee a great Nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy Name great; and thou shalt be a Blessing. And I will Bless them that Bless thee, and Curse him that Curseth thee; and in thee shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed.*

§. 2. If we are to seek therefore of the Covenant of Grace that God made with *Abraham*, which is the Great Charter of the Gentiles hope; behold and see, lo here it is; a Covenant of Grace indeed. A Covenant truly Evangelical, as being every way Extensive, Full, Free, Absolute, and without those Conditions that the Covenant of Circumcision was manifestly clogged withal. And therefore called the Covenant of Promise, in the forementioned 3d of the *Galatians*; for having told us, *vers.* 8. of the Promise that God had made unto *Abraham*, that *in Him should all Nations be Blessed.* And having also told us, *vers.* 14. 16. that *the blessing of* Abraham *was to come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the Promise of the Spirit through Faith.* He adds, vers. 17, 18. *And this I say, that the Covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ; the Law which was 430 years after, cannot disanul that it should make the Promise of none Effect. For if the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise; but God gave it to* Abraham *by Promise.* Which clearly argues the Absoluteness of this Gospel Covenant: For if it had

not

not been Free and Absolute, but Conditional, as the Covenant of Circumcision was, and as the Legal Covenant at Mount *Sinai* was; then according to the Scope of the Apostles Reasoning, it had not properly been a Covenant of Promise, but a Legal Covenant; and so the Inheritance had been of the Law: For wherein differs the Law from a free Promise, but that the one is Conditional, the other Absolute? The one promiseth Life upon condition of Obedience; the other without Mony, and without Price, *Isa.* 55. 1. And therefore the Covenant which God made with the Israelites at Mount *Sinai*, though it had many Glorious Promises in it; that God would be their God, and they should be his peculiar People, and Treasure, *&c.* Yet these Promises being clogged with Conditions of Obedience, impossible to be performed: That Covenant therefore is never presented to us in the Scripture, under the Notion, or Denomination of a Covenant of Promise; but under the Denomination of the Law, or as a Covenant of Works only. *For Moses (*saith the Apostle*) describeth the Righteousness of the Law, that the man that doth these things shall live by them,* Rom. 10. 5, And so likewise, Gal. 3. 10. *As many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curse: For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law, to do them.* And vers. 12. *The Law is not of Faith, but the man that doth them, shall live in them.* And for the same Reason therefore is the Covenant of Circumcision, represented to us also, under the same Denomination of the Law: *Rom.* 4. 13. (as shall be afterward shewn) because though it is true, it had Promises in it that were full and glorious enough; yet those Promises being not absolute, but conditional, as the Covenant at Mount *Sinai* was, it is therefore represented to us under the same Character; and not as a Covenant of Promise, or an Evangelical Covenant: For that is the Peculiar Character or Denomination which is given by the Holy Spirit himself, to the forementioned Covenant, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. which God had made with *Abraham* long before.

§. 3. 'Wherefore (saith Dr. *Owen*) the Covenant of Grace; 'supposing it a New, Real Absolute Covenant, and not a Re-'formation of the Old, or a Reduction of it unto the use of our 'present Condition (as some, saith he, imagine it to be) must dif-'fer in the Essence, Substance, and Nature of it from that First 'Covenant of Works, *Ibid. ut supra*, p. 389.

§. 4.

§. 4. The 'Covenant of Grace (*saith Mr. Troughton*, in a late 'Discourse of his, Entituled, *Lutherus Redivivus*, *Part.* 1. *p.* 111.) 'is expressed in the Nature and Form of a Promise, throughout 'the Scripture. Thus it was to our First Parents, soon after the 'fall, a Promise that the Seed of the Woman should overcome the 'Devil and his Seed: No Terms, no Conditions added, but a bare 'Declaration of Mercy to their Dejected, Self-condemned Con-'sciences. Next when the Covenant was Revealed to *Abraham*, '*Gen.* 12 1, 2, 3. It is a Formal Promise, that God would bless 'him, and all Nations in his Seed; and accordingly ever after it is 'called the Promise made to *Abraham*, which *Israel* waited to see 'performed. And the Apostle, *Gal.* 3. 18. affirms, that the Inheri-'tance was given to *Abraham* by Promise and not by Law; and in '*vers.* 15, 16, 17. he maketh the Covenant and Promise equipollent 'terms. *The Law*, (saith he) *which was* 420 *years after, cannot disan-'nul the Covenant with* Abraham, *that the Promise should be of none 'Effect.* Neither was this Promise only of Christ's coming in the 'Flesh, but of a Blessing through Christ, *vers.* 14. Yea, the giving 'of the Holy Spirit is a part of the Blessing Promised to *Abraham*; '*That the Blessing of* Abraham *might come on the Gentiles through 'Jesus; that we might receive the Promise of the Spirit through 'Faith.*

§. 5. And indeed this is that therefore that renders it sure, and certain to all the Seed therein concerned: For as it is evident, that this Gospel Covenant, mentioned *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. was Preached unto *Abraham*, long before the Covenant of Circumcision was made with him: So the Addition of the Covenant of Circumcision afterwards (as the Apostle speaks of the Law given by *Moses*; *because of transgressions, till the Seed should come, to whom the Promise was made*) could not disannul, that it should make this forementioned, and fore-established Promise to be of none Effect. For it being most plainly a Gospel Covenant, wholly free and absolute, and only to be received by Faith: Hence it follows, that it is of an Everlasting, Unchangeable Nature; and consequently sure, without any possibility of Miscarriage, unto all the Seed thereunto belonging (which the Covenant of Circumcision, being Conditional, was not) as is most excellently reasoned and argued by the Apostle to this purpose, *Rom.* 4. 13. where he tells us, that *the Promise that* Abraham *should be the Heir of the World* (which is the same in effect with his being the *Father of all them that believe*, just before spoken of) *was not to him, or to his seed, through*

through the Law; but through the Righteousness of Faith. Not through the Law; that is, not through the Covenant of Circumcision, (as shall be afterward demonstrated: For that was as much a Covenant of Works, as the Covenant at Mount *Sinai* was, and therefore a Legal Covenant) But through that mentioned, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. which was purely Evangelical; and therefore through the Righteousness of Faith alone: Which gives the only Security to the Seed therein concerned, as is afterwards asserted, *vers.* 14, 15, 16. of the forementioned 4*th* to the *Romans*; *For (saith he) if they, which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none Effect; because the Law worketh wrath: for where no Law is, there is no Transgression. Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end the Promise might be sure to all the Seed, not to that only which is of the Law (that is the Jews) but to that also that is of the Faith of* Abraham *(that is, the Gentiles) who is the Father of us all; as it is written, I have made thee Father of many Nations; according to that which was spoken; so shall thy Seed be.*

SECT. II.

§. 1. IT is indeed suggested by Dr. *Burthogg*; That the forementioned Promise, *That* Abraham *should be the Heir of the World,* (which as the Apostle tells, *was not to him, or to his Seed through the Law; but through the Righteousness of Faith*) is to be understood in reference to *Gen.* 17. 8. Where God promiseth to *give unto* Abraham. *and to his Seed after him, the Land of* Canaan *for an Everlasting Possession.* From whence he infers, that the Covenant there mentioned, is a Covenant of Faith, and therefore a Covenant of Grace. But it doth not follow, because *Canaan* was promised in the Covenant of Circumcision, that therefore, according to the Apostles reckoning, that Covenant should be a Covenant of Faith: For as much as the Promise concerning *Abraham's Heirship of the World,* which the Apostle here speaks of, is of a vastly different Nature from the *Promise of* Canaan; or indeed any Terrestrial Inheritance whatsoever.

§. 2. It is true, as the Apostle tells us, That *Godliness is profitable unto all things*; that is, in all respects; in respect of this World, as well as in respect of the other. And why so? Because it hath the Promise: *Having the Promise of the Life that now*

now is, as well as of that to come. In which respect it ought to be duly observed, that *Abraham* was promised *Canaan* long before the Covenant of Circumcision was made with him: For so we are told, Gen. 12. 7. *The Lord appeared unto* Abraham, *and said, unto thy Seed will I give this Land.* So Gen. 13. 15. *All the Land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy Seed for ever.* So likewise Gen. 15. 18. *In that same day the Lord made a Covenant with* Abraham; *saying, unto thy Seed have I given this Land, from the River of* Egypt, *unto the Great River, the River* Euphrates. From all which it plainly appears, that *Abraham* was promised *Canaan* long before the Covenant of Circumcision was made with him? And it was indeed therefore a free Promise, or a part of that Covenant of Promise, which the Apostle speaks of, *Gal.* 3. 17, 18. which was afterward ratified and confirmed by Oath, so as that it shall never be disannulled; For so we are expressly assured, Psal. 105. 8, 9, 10, 11. *He hath remembred his Covenant for ever, the Word which he commanded to a thousand Generations; which Covenant he made with* Abraham, *and his Oath unto* Isaac, *and confirmed the same unto* Jacob *for a Law, and to* Israel *for an Everlasting Covenant; saying, unto thee will I give the Land of* Canaan, *the lot of your Inheritance.* And though 'tis true, *Canaan* was only promised in the Letter, and was inherited only by the Carnal Seed and Descendants of *Abraham*; yet in the mystery, it means the *whole World*, of which *Canaan* was a part, in which he took Possession; or as it were, had Livery and Seisin given him in the name of the whole.

§. 3. The like is to be said concerning the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*; even the Gentiles also, on whom that self-same Blessing of *Abraham* (as being the fruit of the Free Promise) doth also descend. For in this respect it is that the Apostle tells us, that *all is ours*: But how? *For we are Christ's, and Christ is God's.* And therefore as God hath promised, that *the Meek shall inherit the Earth*, Psal. 37. 11. Mat. 5. 5. So he hath also promised, that *the Kingdom and Dominion, and the Greatness of the Kingdom and Dominion, under the whole Heaven shall be given to the People of the Saints of the Most High, whose Kingdom is an Everlasting Kingdom.* So likewise, Rev. 5. 10. *Thou hast made us unto our God, Kings and Priests, and we shall Reign upon the Earth.* All which are glorious Promises, and shall certainly receive their full accomplishment in the appointed Season; as being indeed no other than Gospel Promises; and of the same Nature with the free Promise of that Kind, even the Promise of *Canaan*, made pro-

to *Abraham*, long before the Covenant of Circumcision was made with him. So that it is no wonder that the Apostle tells us he doth, that *Godliness hath the Promise of the Life that now is, as well as of that that is to come.*

§. 4. 'Tis true, *Canaan* was promised in the Covenant of Circumcision also, as was also the Promise of a Cœlestial Inheritance too: When God told *Abraham*, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee; I will give unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a stranger; All the Land of Canaan, for an Everlasting Possession; and I will be their God*, Gen. 17. 7, 8. But all these Promises, though good enough in themselves; yet being *Conditional*, they were therefore *failable*, and still liable to *forfeiture*, as they were contained in *that Covenant*. And therefore the Apostle would have us strictly to observe, that the forementioned Promise, concerning *Abraham's Heirship* (whatever it signifies) *was not to him, or to his Seed through the Law, but through the Righteousness of Faith.* For though it should be granted that it hath reference to a Terrestrial Inheritance in *Canaan*, and consequently to his Interest in the whole World, in the sense but now mentioned: Yet forasmuch as this Promise was made unto him, long before his Circumcision; and was therefore a part of the free Promise: The Apostle doth sufficiently suggest, that that was the Promise he had most reason to trust unto, or to relie upon, as being a far surer Promise of the two (and that both to himself and his Seed also) than was the Promise of the same kind, as it was contained in the Covenant of Circumcision; which the Scripture doth so plainly represent unto us as a *Conditional Covenant*. *The Promise* (saith he) *was not to him, nor to his Seed, through the Law.* And why not through the Law? *Because* (as he also tells us in the very next following words) *If they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none effect: Because the Law worketh wrath; for where no Law is, there is no Transgression. Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace; to the end the Promise might be sure to all the Seed.* The like he tells the *Galatians* also, chap. 3. 18. *If the Inheritance be of the Law, it is no more of Promise; But God gave it to* Abraham *by Promise.* Which clearly argues the Freeness, or Absoluteness thereof; which the Covenant of Circumcision was not: It being evident, that it obliged all that were under it to Perfect and Universal Obedience, as the Condition of Obtaining the Mercies therein contained, Gal. 5. 3. *For I testifie to every man that is Circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law.*

And therefore though 'tis true, *Canaan* was promised in that Covenant as well as in the other; as was also the Promise of the Cœlestial Inheritance too; when God promised *to be a God to* Abraham, *and to his Seed*; yet those Promises there mentioned, being bounded as they were with Conditions impossible to be performed, and therefore of a Legal Stamp, and liable to forfeiture: That is not the Way, that is not the Channel, through which the Blessings in Promise must be derived unto the Heirs of Promise: For if ever they be derived, it must be through the Free Promise, and through that alone. Yea, if ever they be derived, it must be through the Free Promise, or not at all. For (saith he) *verse.* 21. *If there had been a Law given, that could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law: But the Scripture hath concluded all under Sin, that the Promise by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.*

§. 5. But as we have already said, the Promise that *Abraham* should be *the Heir of the World*, is of a vastly different nature from *the Promise of* Canaan; neither indeed is it at all contained in the Covenant of Circumcision, where the Promise of *Canaan* is inserted: For it is evident, that the Promise that *Abraham* should be the Heir of the World, hath a single reference to *his Fatherhood unto all them that believe*; that is, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; or *the whole World of Believers*. Thus *Paræus* in his Comment upon the Place, carries the sense of the Words; and so the Apostle himself interprets it, *verse.* 11, 12. And it is as evident, that there is no Promise at all of that kind in the Covenant of Circumcision, that *Abraham should be the Common Father of all them that Believe*; That Covenant having a plain reference to *Abraham's Natural Posterity only*; for as much as all those to whom the Promises of that Covenant were made, were bound to be Circumcised, as the Sign or Token of it; which doth not concern the *Gentiles* at all. So that it is the Gospel Covenant therefore which we have before spoken of, which we find mentioned. *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. and not the Covenant of Circumcision, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. that is, the Great Charter, by which the Believing *Gentiles* always did, and do rightly claim both Heaven and Earth, and all the Promises they have Title to.

SECT. III.

§. 1. BUT whereas the Doctor lays a mighty ſtreſs upon thoſe words of the Apoſtle before mentioned *Rom.* 4. 13. *For the Promiſe that he ſhould be the Heir of the World was not to* Abraham *or to his Seed through the Law; but through the Righteouſneſs of Faith.* Whereby he endeavours to prove that the Covenant of Circumciſion, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. is that very Covenant of Grace that the Believing *Gentiles* are now under, and from whence all their hopes and Comforts are derived; We muſt, of neceſſity therefore endeavour to overthrow and remove the ſeeming ſtrength of what he offers by way of oppoſition to what we have aſſerted, before any thorow Concluſion can be drawn.

§. 2. The Sum then of his Argument is this; 'It is Evident (ſaith he) that the Covenant of Promiſe made to *Abraham*, 'which is called the Bleſſing of *Abraham*, is ſtill in being; and 'is the Covenant of Grace, into a Participation of which the 'true Believing *Gentiles* are taken; which is the true ground and 'Foundation of all their hopes and Comforts: For thus the 'Apoſtle carries it when he affirms that God gave the Inheritance 'to *Abraham* by Promiſe. And by what Promiſe, but that 'ratified Covenant of Promiſe. *I will be a God to thee and to thy* 'Seed. ——— In ſhort (ſaith he) this is the Climax. If Believers 'then Chriſts; If Chriſts then *Abrahams* Seed; If *Abrahams* 'Seed then Heirs according to the Promiſe: For the Promiſe is; '*I will be a God to thee and thy Seed*; *And I will give to thee and* 'thy Seed. Nor doth it make any alteration in the caſe, that Faith 'is now the requiſite condition of Salvation; or that we muſt 'believe to be ſaved. This but Evidences the more clearly that 'the Goſpel is but a Renovation of the Covenant of *Abraham*; 'For as it is through Faith that we *Gentiles* do become Chriſts, 'and by being Chriſts that we become the Seed of *Abraham*, 'and conſequently Heirs of Salvation according to the Promiſe; 'ſo it was through Faith, the Righteouſneſs of Faith that *Abraham* 'the Father of the Faithful had the Promiſe himſelf. For ſo the 'Apoſtle, Rom. 4. 13. *For the Promiſe that he ſhould be the* 'Heir of the World, was not to Abraham, or to his Seed through 'the Law; but through the Righteouſneſs of Faith. And if the

'Promiſe

'Promiſe made to *Abraham* be the ground and Foundation of all 'our hopes and expectations as we are Chriſtians, and it be the 'true Covenant of Grace, to be ſure it is ſtill in being, or we do 'but beat the Air, and are at a loſs; our hope is in vain, and our 'rejoycing vain, which God forbid.

'I know you take it for a very ſtrong Argument, that the Co-'venant of *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. cannot be the Evangelical or 'Goſpel Covenant, becauſe it is a Mixt one, and Compoſed of a 'Temporal (as well as an Eternal) bequeſt: But for that Reaſon, 'I the rather take it to be Evangelical: For this is Goſpel, that '*Godlineſs is profitable unto all things*, that is in all Reſpects; 'In reſpect of this World, and in reſpect of the other; And why 'ſo? Why it hath the Promiſe. *Having the Promiſe of the Life 'that now is, as well as of that to come.* And what is this but a 'finger to point you to the Covenant of Promiſe, as the Evange-'lical Covenant, the Promiſe, the Bleſſing that did deſcend on 'the *Gentiles*. And indeed the Inheritance promiſed to *Abra-'ham*, and which in, by, and under him is deſcended on the '*Gentiles*, is not onely a Coeleſtial, but a Terreſtrial one alſo: 'For by that Promiſe *Abraham* was not onely the *Heir of Hea-'ven*; but alſo *Heir of the World*. And ſo the Apoſtle ſtyles 'him. And the ſame Apoſtle tells us *all is ours*; And *Abraham* 'being Conſtituted by the Promiſe, Heir of the World; he and 'his deſcendants according to the Fleſh were to take Poſſeſſion of 'it, and to have Livery of Seiſin given in *Canaan*; a Livery of 'Seiſin, which was given indeed, and taken but in part of the 'World, (as Livery of Seiſin uſually is) but in the Name of the 'whole. From the whole of which the Doctor Infers; That that Covenant mentioned, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. where this Promiſe of a Terreſtrial Inheritance bequeathed to *Abraham* and his Seed, is Inſerted (which he takes to be the ſame with his being the Heir of the World) muſt be a Covenant of Grace, or an Evangelical Covenant: For ſince the Promiſe that *Abraham* ſhould be *the Heir of the World, was not to him, or to his Seed through the Law; but through the Righteouſneſs of Faith*; Therefore the Covenant mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. where this Promiſe is Inſert-ed, muſt of neceſſity be a Covenant of Grace, and ſuch a Cove-nant as on which all the Hopes and Comforts of Believing *Gentiles* are Built.

§. 3. This is the ſubſtance of what the Doctor offers; by which it may be eaſily perceived that there is a neceſſity that this now mentioned Argument of his, be ſubſtantially reſolved, and

removed out of the way, before we can draw any thorow Conclusion from the Premises; It being true enough; That if *Abrahams* Heirship of the World, spoken of *Rom.* 4. 13. And the Promise of a Terrestrial Inheritance in *Canaan*, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 8. be one and the same thing, and not of a quite different nature; then indeed, there will be some kind of appearance, or some shadow at least of Argument in what the Doctor offers, toward the proof of what he asserteth; That the Covenant mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. is the Covenant of Grace. Though should it be granted that the Doctors Notion is right; That *Abrahams* Heirship of the World, is to be understood of the Promise of a Terrestrial Inheritance in *Canaan*; Yet it will not therefore follow, that the Inheritance the Apostle speaks of, is derived unto *Abraham* or to his Seed, through the Righteousness of that Covenant, and consequently that it is a Gospel Covenant: Because (as hath been already observed) though that be one of the Promises contained in that Covenant; yet since the same thing had been before assured unto *Abraham*, and his Seed also, by vertue of the free Promise, mentioned *Gen.* 12. 7. *&c.* which the Apostle takes such special notice of *Gal.* 3. 17-18. And forasmuch as the Conditional Covenant of Circumcision, might be broken as it was; and the Mercies therein contained, forfeited, as they were; which the other could not: From hence it plainly follows, that the free Promise, and that alone, is that Covenant of Grace, or Anchor of Hope, that both *Abraham* and his Seed were onely to trust unto, and through which the Inheritance was to be derived.

SECT. IV.

HOwever, since the Doctor lays the stress he doth upon the Argument before us; It is necessary that it be Examined, and brought to the Test, whether right or no? In order whereunto our main business will be to prove that *Abrahams Heirship of the World*, spoken of *Rom.* 4. 13. And the Promise that was made unto him of a *Terrestrial Inheritance in Canaan*, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 8. is not one and the same Promise; but of a vastly different Nature and Tendency. The one being the Great Charter of all the *Gentiles* hope and blessedness, in reference both to this World, and that that is to come; The other being the Promise of a Terrestrial Inheritance onely, and that which concerned *Abraham*

him alone, and his Natural Off-spring. And if this can be substantially proved, it will easily be acknowledged that the Doctors forementioned Argument falls to the ground. In order therefore hereunto two things must be done, and that is; First diligently to Examin the Scope of *Rom.* 4. 13. where the words themselves do lie that are the bottom of his Argument. And Secondly to compare that with other Scriptures that give light thereunto.

§. 2. As to the Scope of the place mentioned; It ought to be duely observed, that in the 11*th* and 12*th* Verses, it is told us of *Abraham*, That *he received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith, which he had yet being Uncircumcized, that he might be the Father of all them that Believe, though they be not Circumcised, that Righteousness might be Imputed to them also. And the Father of Circumcision, to them who are not of the Circumcision onely, but also walk in the steps of that Faith of our Father* Abraham, *which he had yet being Uncircumcised.* The plain Scope of which is to shew that *Abraham* was appointed by God as *the Common Father of all sorts of true Believers whatsoever, whether* Jews *or* Gentiles; And that this Divine Priviledge was not conferred on him upon the Account of the Works he had before spoken of *Verse* 2. 3. or because of his Circumcision which was a main part thereof, and which he had been just now insisting on; but through Faith; Even that Faith which he had *yet being Uncircumcised.* Which self same Argument he further prosecutes in the next following words. *For* (saith he immediately *Vers.* 13.) *the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World, was not to* Abraham *or to his Seed, through the Law, but through the Righteousness of Faith.* Now let it be Judged what was the Apostles meaning, as to *Abrahams* Heirship of the World; whether it were concerning the Promise made unto him of a *Terrestrial Inheritance in Canaan*, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 8. that in *that* respect he should be the *Heir of the World*? Or rather whether it is not to be understood concerning *his Common Fatherhood to all them that Believe*; which he had just before been speaking of? For there he had been plainly treating, not concerning any *Terrestrial Inheritance* whatsoever; but concerning *Abrahams Spiritual Relation as a Father to all sorts of true Believers.* And in that sense the words in the 13*th Verse* come in most aptly and Coherently with what he had before told us; which was that *Faith was reckoned to* Abraham *for Righteousness, not in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision*, even long before he

was Circumcised. That *he received the Sign of Circumcision a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had yet being Uncircumcised that he might be the Father of all them that Believe*, as well *Jews* as *Gentiles*, and *Gentiles* as *Jews*, *Vers.* 10. 11, 12. In which respect well might the Apostle tell us as he doth, *Vers.* 13. that *Abraham* was promised that he should be *the Heir of the World*; Since the whole World both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call, were now to become his Spiritual Seed by Believing.

§. 3. And that this is the true Scope and Genuine Sence of the place, is plain also from the following words; when he comes to the proof of what he had Asserted, *Vers.* 13. For (saith he *Vers.* 14) *If they which are of the Law be Heirs; Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none effect, because the Law worketh Wrath: For where no Law is, there is no Transgression. Therefore it is of Faith that it might be by Grace, that the Promise might be sure to all the Seed; not to that only which is of the Law* (that is the Jews) *but to that also which is of the Faith of Abraham* (that is the *Gentiles*) *who is the Father of us all.* What *Promise* is it the Apostle here speaketh of? No doubt the same Promise he had spoken of just before, even *the Promise that* Abraham *should be the Heir of the World*; or as he here expresseth it; *The Father of us all.* But how doth that appear? Or where is that Promise? *As it is Written* (saith he Vers. 17.) *I have made thee a Father of many Nations, before him whom he Believed; even God who quickeneth the dead; who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the Father of many Nations, according to that which was spoken; so shall thy Seed be.* Wherein it is evident what was the Apostles meaning when he tells us of the Promise that *Abraham* should be *the Heir of the World*; that is, not that he should be *the Heir of Canaan*, or of any *Terrestrial Inheritance* whatsoever (though that be true too, and is a part of the same Gospel Covenant, as hath been before proved; and shall therefore be gloriously fulfiled in the appointed Season; when not *Canaan* only shall be the Possession and Inheritance of Gods People; but *the greatness of the Kingdom and Dominion under the whole Heaven shall be given unto them*) But that which the Apostle intends in these words, is, that *Spiritual Relation* wherunto *Abraham* was designed and appointed by God, as *the Father of many Nations*; *Or the Father of all them that Believe*; *according to that which was spoken so shall thy Seed be.* Wherein he plainly refers to the Gospel Covenant

which

which was first Recorded, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. that God had made with *Abraham* before his removal out of his own Country; and therefore long before the Covenant of Circumcision was made with him: For then God first promised that *he would make of him a Great Nation; make his Name Great*; and, that *in him should all the Families of the Earth be blessed*; which free Gospel Covenant was again repeated; *Gen.* 15. 5. and *Gen.* 17. 4, 5. where it is promised, that there should be of the Nations innumerable, that should be *Abraham's* Seed by Believing. To which the Apostle plainly refers in the forementioned *Rom.* 4. 17. *As it is written* (saith he) *I have made thee a Father of many Nations, before him whom he believed; according to that which was spoken, so shall thy Seed be.* For in this respect we are told, *Gen.* 15. 6. That *Abraham believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for Righteousness.*

§. 4. And in respect of this Covenant it is, that the Apostle affirms, as before, that *the Promise is sure to all the Seed.* For as herein was promised a Blessing unto all the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*; even the whole Family of the Faithful throughout the World, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*; of whom, through Christ, he was to be Father (whereas there is no such Promise contained in the Covenant of Circumcision:) So the tenor of it being purely Evangelical (which the Covenant of Circumcision was not:) This therefore, and not the other, is the Great Charter, and only Firm Deed of Gift, by which the Believing *Gentiles* always did, and do claim Heaven and Earth, and all the Promises they have Title to.

§. 5. Besides, that the Promise that *Abraham should be the Heir of the World*, cannot be understood of an *Earthly Inheritance*, but the *call of the* Gentiles; and consequently hath reference to his Universal Fatherhood to all sorts of true Believers whatsoever, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*; is yet further evident from what the same Apostle tells us, Rom. 11, 11, 12, 13. *Have they stumbled* (saith he, speaking of the *Jews*) *that they should fall? God forbid: But rather through their fall Salvation is come unto the* Gentiles. *Now if the Fall of them be the Riches of the World, and the Diminishing of them the Riches of the* Gentiles; *How much more their Fulness?* And so likewise vers. 15. *If the Casting away of them, be the Reconciling of the World, what shall the Receiving of them be, but Life from the Dead?* Where the same expression is made use of in reference to the Call of the

Gen-

Gentiles, as had been before made use of *Chap.* 4. 13. concerning *Abraham's* Heirship: For as *Abraham* by Promise was to be *the Heir of the World*; so the Call of the *Gentiles* is here said to be *the Riches of the World*. The same expression we have likewise in reference to Christ, 1 John 2. 2. *And he is the Propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole World*. Not for ours only; that is, not only for us *Jews*, but for the sins of the whole World; that is, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; because the Partition Wall between *Jew* and *Gentile* was now broken down. In the same sense therefore, that Christ is here said to be *the Propitiation for the sins of the whole World*. In the same sense is *Abraham* said to be *the Heir of the whole World*; that is, he was constituted or appointed to be an Universal Father unto all them that Believe, not only *Jews* but *Gentiles* also. And indeed, as the Blessing of *Abraham* is hereby said to come upon the *Gentiles*, through Jesus Christ, *Gal.* 3. 14. So had it not been for this Gospel Promise, the poor *Gentiles* had still remained without hope of Relief, or ground of Comfort; strangers to the Covenants of Promise, and without God in the World; there being no ground of Relief, or hope of Comfort at all afforded unto them, from the Covenant of Circumcision.

§. 6. And in this respect therefore, whereas the Apostle tells us in the forementioned *Rom.* 4. 13. That *the Promise that* Abraham *should be the Heir of the World, was not to him, or to his Seed* [through the Law] *but through the Righteousness of Faith*. It is yet further observable, that the *Law* he here speaks of, and which he doth so manifestly contradistinguish or oppose unto *the Righteousness of Faith*; cannot be understood concerning the Law given by *Moses* to that People in the Wilderness 400 years after *Abraham's* time (though it was of the same nature:) But it must of necessity be understood concerning the Law, or Covenant of Circumcision, which God made with *Abraham* himself, and his Natural Posterity; which was extant in his own time. And that this is the Law which the Apostle here intends, will evidently appear, if we duly attend unto the scope of the Apostle in the foregoing part of this fourth to the *Romans*: which was to shew, that *Abraham* himself was not justified by Works; no not by his Circumcision, but by Faith, which he had long before he was Circumcised. For thus he begins, vers. 1. 2. *What shall we say then, that* Abraham *our Father, as pertaining to the Flesh, hath found? For if* Abraham *were justified by Works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. For what saith the Scripture?* Abraham *believed*

believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness. So then *Abraham* was not justified by Works before God, but by Faith alone. But how doth that appear? Why, thus it appears, *verſ.* 9, 10. Becauſe *Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteouſneſs, when he was in Circumciſion, but in Uncircumciſion.* And ſo verſ. 11, 12. *He received* (ſaith he) *the Sign of Circumciſion, a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of the Faith which he had, yet being Uncircumciſed, that he might be the Father of all them that believe,* &c. *For* (ſaith he) verſ. 13. *the Promiſe that he ſhould be the Heir of the World* (or as he had ſaid juſt before, that he ſhould be *the Father of all them that believe*) *was not to* Abraham, *or to his Seed through the Law*; (which muſt needs therefore be underſtood of the Law of Circumciſion) *but through the Righteouſneſs of Faith.* From whence, as it hath been already made evident, the Promiſe he here ſpeaks of, was not derived unto *Abraham*, or to his Seed, through the Covenant of Circumciſion; there being no ſuch Promiſe at all to be found in that Covenant: So it is as manifeſt that the Covenant of Circumciſion was not a Covenant of Faith; ſince it is here ſo plainly contradiſtinguiſhed, or oppoſed thereunto.

SECT. V.

AND therefore, whereas the Apoſtle tells us of *Abraham* in the formentioned, *Rom.* 4. 11. That *he received the Sign of Circumciſion, a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of the Faith which he had, yet being Uncircumciſed.* From thence to infer, that the Covenant of Circumciſion was a *Covenant of Faith*; would be point blank to contradict the whole ſcope and deſign of the Apoſtle in the foregoing paſſages of that Chapter; which (as hath been already ſhewn) as it was in general to prove, that *Abraham* was not juſtified by *Works*, but by *Faith only*, verſ. 2. 3, 4, 5. So in particular to aſſure us; that *Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteouſneſs, when he was in Circumciſion, but in Uncircumciſion*, verſ. 9, 10. And what more convincing Teſtimony or Evidence can we deſire, that the Covenant of Circumciſion was not a Covenant of Faith? The Sign of Circumciſion was indeed a Seal unto *Abraham* of *the Faith which he had*, in reſpect of the Promiſes made him, *yet being Uncircumciſed*: But it doth not therefore follow, that the Promiſes, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. that *God would be a God unto him, and his Seed after him in their Generations*,

tions, &c. upon Condition, that he and his were Circumcised; were any part of the *Covenant of Faith*: For otherwise the Apostle would never have told us as he doth; that *Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision.* The Argument hence resulting therefore is Irrefistable: That Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness, could never be a Covenant of Faith: But the Scripture is express, that *Faith was not reckoned to* Abraham *for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision*; therefore the Covenant of Circumcision could never be a Covenant of Faith. Besides it is evident, that long before his Circumcision, God had promised *Abraham to bless him; to make his Name Great; that he should be a Blessing; that in him should all the Families of the Earth be Blessed; that he should be the Father of many Nations, according to that which was spoken, so shall thy Seed be*, Gen. 12. 2, 3. Gen. 15. 5. And it is evident that *these were the Promises*; upon the account whereof we are told, that *he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for Righteousness*, Gen. 15. 6. Circumcision therefore was a Seal only unto *Abraham*; and that of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had in respect of the Promises made him, *long before his Circumcision*; and that for this very purpose, that *he might be the Father of all them that believe*; which was his Prerogative alone: For none besides him had ever before their Circumcision, such a Faith which entituled them to such singular Promises.

§. 2. Upon the whole; though it must be acknowledged that the Objection seems at first very Plausible; *How can it be but that the Covenant of Circumcision must needs be a Covenant of Faith, since* Abraham *is said to have received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith?* Yet we see when it comes to be duly examined, there appears no such matter: For the only Argument fairly resulting from *Rom.* 4. 11. can be no other than this. That Covenant, or those Promises, in respect of which *Abraham* is said to have received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, must needs be a Covenant of Faith: But the Scripture is express, that Abraham *received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had, yet being Uncircumcised*: (which must of necessity be understood in respect of the forementioned Promises, that had been made him long before his Circumcision, and upon the account of which we are expressly told, that *he believed in the Lord*

Lord, and he counted it to him for Righteousness, Gen. 15. 6.) Therefore that Covenant, or those Promises, must needs be a Covenant of Faith. But then, as hath been already observed, it follows not, that *the Promises made unto him, and his Seed after him, in their Generations; upon Condition of his, and their Circumcision*, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. were any part of the *Covenant of Faith*; since the Apostle is express, that *Faith was not reckoned to him for Righteousness, when he was in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision.*

§. 3. Circumcision therefore (as we have said) was a Seal only to *Abraham*; and that in respect of the Promises, made him, *yet being Uncircumcised*; whereby he was Confirmed in the Assurance of that Peculiar Prerogative that had been before conferred on him; and which the Apostle here expressly mentioneth. *He received* (saith he) *the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had, yet being Uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all them that believe.* In respect whereof it is evident, that Circumcision was that to the Father of the Faithful, in its *Extraordinary Institution*, and in his *Extraordinary Circumstances*, that it could not be to any of his Natural Progeny in its *Ordinary Use*. It was indeed appointed as a *Sign* or *Token* of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. and that both unto *Abraham* himself, and the rest that were under it; and so the Spirit of God himself expressly stiles it, *vers.* 11. Whereby they were obliged unto a Perfect and Universal Obedience to the whole revealed Will and Law of God, Gal. 5. 3. *For I testifie to every man that is Circumcised, that he is a Debtor to do the whole Law*; and hereof 'tis true, it was a *Sign* or *Token*: It being no other than the *Restipulation* of the Covenant on their part, Gen. 17. 9, 10. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations; this is my Covenant which ye shall keep.* —— *Every man-child among you shall be Circumcised.* But it doth not therefore follow, that because it was a *Token* of that Covenant on their part, *in respect of their Duty*; that it was also intended as a Seal unto them of the same Covenant on God's part, *in respect of God's Promise*: It being a *Seal* only unto *Abraham*; and that in respect of those Peculiar Promises made him in Uncircumcision. Nor was every ones Circumcision, so much as a *Token* to him of his *Right to any of the Promises* therein contained; as is evident in *Ishmael* and others, the Servants born and bred in *Abraham's* Family, and Strangers bought with Mony, who were all to be Circumcised; to whom yet nevertheless,

less, none of the Promises in that Covenant were made; as is plain from *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 20, 21, 23, 27. whereby it is clear, that the true Reason why any were Circumcised, was the *Command*, not *Interest in the Covenant*. Much less was Circumcision a Seal to all that received it of their interest in the Righteousness of that Faith that *Abraham* had. And it is equally absurd to say, that Circumcision was a Seal unto all its Subjects of the Righteousness of Faith, which they had while Uncircumcised; (since many of them were never Possessors of that saving Grace, neither before or after) as to affirm that it was the Seal of a Paternal Relation to all Believers, unto every one that received it; this being *Abraham's* Peculiar Prerogative, and Incommunicable to any else. And indeed Circumcision was so far from being a *Seal of the Gospel Covenant*, or of their Interest in the Righteousness of Faith, to the rest that were under it, that it was rather *Token unto them of Servitude and Bondage*; and such a *Yoke*, that as the Apostles tell them, *neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear it*, Acts 15. 10, 24. Gal. 5. 2. 3. Which yet it had not been, had it been to them a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, or of the Gospel Covenant: For that brings with it true Christian Liberty and Freedom, *Gal.* 5. 1.

SECT. VI.

AND therefore when the Apostle tells us, *Gal.* 3. 16. that *to Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made; He saith not unto Seeds as of many, but as of one; and to thy Seed, which is Christ.* He could not have the *Covenant of Circumcision* in his Eye (as 'tis generally concluded he had:) For as hath been plainly proved, that was no other than a *Covenant of Works*, or a Legal Covenant, obliging all that were under it to a perfect Obedience to the whole Law, *Gal.* 5. 3. And therefore as the Promise that *Abraham should be the Heir of the World*, was not derived unto him or to his Seed through the Righteousness of that Covenant: So neither was Christ the Mediator of it: *He having obtained a more Excellent Ministry; by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which is established upon better Promises*, Heb. 8. 6. Better Promises, not for the Substance of them, in themselves considered. For as God promised to be a God unto that People in the Covenant of Works, made at Mount *Sinai*; and to take them for his Peculiar People, upon Condition

of

of their Obedience to the Law: So in the Covenant of Circumcision; *I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed; And I will give to thee and to thy Seed the Land of Canaan*, &c. upon the same condition of Obedience. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations.* In both which the Promises themselves, are as large and as full as can be desired; And that with Respect to the Blessings of this Life, as also of that which is to come: So that the Promises of the Gospel Covenant it self cannot be better than were those under the Law, for the substance of them, or in themselves considered: For what doth the Gospel promise more? The betterness therefore of this Evangelical Covenant (whereof Christ is the onely Mediator and Surety) must of necessity consist in the terms of it; the Promises thereof being free and Absolute; and onely to be Received by Faith; (which the forementioned Covenants were not) And therefore called *the Word of Faith which we Preach*, Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8. *That if thou shalt Confess with thy Mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine Heart that God raised him from the Dead thou shalt be saved.* He had told us before that *Moses describeth the Righteousness of the Law, that the Man which doth those things shall live by them*: But (saith he) *the Righteousness which is of Faith speaketh on this wise*, &c. So likewise Gal. 3. 21, 22. *If there had been a Law which could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law*: But *the Scripture hath Concluded all under Sin, that the Promise by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that Believe.* So also Rom. 4. 14. *If they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect. Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace, that the Promise might be sure to all the Seed.* The Gospel Covenant therefore we see is free and Absolute; Proclaiming *Liberty to the Captives*, &c. Isa. 61. 1, 2. And declareth that to *him that worketh not, but believeth on him that Justifieth the ungodly, his Faith shall be counted to him for Righteousness*, Rom. 4. 4, 5. Whereas the Covenant at *Sinai*, and that of Circumcision, was clog'd with conditions of perfect Obedience unto the whole Law of God; and therefore Impossible to be performed. For the faultiness of both which in that respect, they are therefore now Abolished. So that Christ was not the Mediator of either of these; but of this better Covenant which is Established upon these better Promises.

§. 2. Besides

§. 2. Besides, when the Apostle tells us; That *to Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made; he saith not unto Seeds as of many; but as of one; and to thy Seed which is Christ.* He could not have the Covenant of Circumcision in his Eye: Because the Promises of that Covenant were expressly made unto Seeds as of many Gen. 17. 7, 8. 9. *I will Establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee in their Generations,* plainly and expressly Plural. *And I will give to thee and to thy Seed after thee the Land wherein thou art a stranger, and I will be their God,* still expressly in the Plural, and not in the Singular Number. And so runs the Obligation also. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations.* Those words of the Apostle therefore *Gal.* 3. 16. cannot possibly refer to the Promises contained in the Covenant of Circumcision; (as it hath been generally though mistakingly imagined they do) But must of necessity refer to that Evangelical Covenant, first Recorded *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. *I will make of thee* (saith God to *Abraham* there) *a Great Nation, and I will Bless thee, and make thy Name Great, and thou shalt be a Blessing. And I will bless them that Bless thee, and Curse him that Curseth thee; And in thee shall all Families of the Earth be Blessed.* Which latter Promise is afterwards more fully Explained *Gen.* 22. 18. *And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed.* In which respect well might the Apostle say that *to* Abraham *and his Seed were the Promises made; he saith not unto Seeds as of many; but as of one; and to thy Seed which is Christ:* For those Gospel Promises can be understood in no other Sence; but as of one: For it is plain that it is Christ alone that is the Promised Seed there spoken of; In whom God there promiseth that *all the Nations of the Earth should be Blessed.* To him therefore all the Promises of the Gospel were first made, *Psal.* 89. 27, 28, 29. *In him they are all, yea and Amen,* 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. And from him alone are they to be Communicated to all his Members, *Isa.* 49. 6, 8, 9. *Jo.* 1. 16. *Jo.* 6. 27. *Gal.* 3. 29. 'Some refer *Gal.* 3. 16. to *Gen.* 17. 7. But I conceive the A-'postle hath here a direct and special Eye to that Promise, *Gen.* '22. 18. In thy Seed shall all the Families of the Earth be 'blessed, which runs directly parallel both in Terms and Sence 'with the Promise given to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 12. 3. which was be-'fore pleaded by him, *Gal.* 3. 8. —— And if it be Objected, that 'the Promise there is made *of* or *concerning Abrahams* Seed, and 'not *to* his Seed; Let it be minded that all the Promises made *of*

'this

'this Seed (*viz.* Christ) in one respect, may be said to be made 'to this Seed in another, because they are Originally Established 'in the Everlasting Covenant of Redemption, that was between 'the Father and him. Mr. *Cox* in his Discourse of the Cove-'nants, *page* 77. 78, 79.

SECT. VII.

AND in this respect it is yet further Observable, That as God promiseth *Abraham*, *Gen.* 22. 18. *That in his Seed should all the Nations of the Earth be blessed*; plainly speaking of Christ the Promised Seed: So in the words just before he was also Expressly told; *And thy Seed shall Possess the Gate of his Enemies*: Not their Enemies, but his Enemies; expressly in the *Singular*, whereas the Promises of the Covenant of Circumcision were all in Expressly in the *Plural* Number: So that as the Apostle might justly say in Reference to this Gospel Covenant, that to *Abraham* and his Seed were the *Promises* made; not a single Promise onely, but the *Promises*: So it is as evident that Seed, there, must of necessity be understood in the Singular Number: For as it is by Christs Single Prowess, that both his and his Peoples Enemies are vanquisht, *Isa.* 63. 3. *John* 16. *ult.* In which respect *Abraham* was told, *And thy Seed shall Possess the Gate of his Enemies*: So it is as evident that the following Promise, *And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed*; The Seed there spoken of must of necessity also be understood in the Singular, and cannot be understood in the Plural Number, as having any Reference to *Abrahams* Natural Posterity (nor indeed to any other sort of Seed) That as well as the foregoing Promise having a Single Reference unto Christ, the Promised Seed, to whom alone the Promises were made. And therefore the Apostle having said, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to* Abraham *and his Seed were the Promises made*; *he saith not, And to Seeds, as of many*; *but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ.* To give a convincing Evidence that he meant it of Christ *Personal*, and not *Mystical* (as some have Dreamed) he doth sufficiently explain his meaning in this Respect, *Vers.* 19. where he tells us, that *the Law was added because of Transgression, till the Seed should come to whom the Promise was made.* Where it is observable that the

Law (that is the Mosaical Administration) is said to have been before the Seed was come, and was to have its Period then. Now if by the Seed, Christ be not to be understood Personally, but Mystically, for the Visible or Invisible Church (take which you will) then the Law could not have been before the Seed: For God had his Church in the World from the Beginning of it; and more especially in *Abrahams* Family, Four Hundred Years at least before the Law was given by *Moses*, of which Christ was the head, and they his Mystical Body. And so by this Interpretation the Seed should have been before the Law; contrary to the Apostle, who makes the Law to have been before the Seed, and to have its Period when the Seed to whom the Promise was made was come. 'Some do Interpret this Text in *Gallatians* of Christ *Mystical*, 'because of the Order of the Words. The Promise is made first 'unto *Abraham*, then unto his Seed; Therefore (say they) it is 'such a *Seed as* comes to have Right in the Promise Second to 'Abraham, and as his Children. But I should rather apply them 'to Christ as *Personally* Considered; For the Seed to whom the 'Promise is made, is the same *in whom all the Nations of the* 'Earth are Blessed, Gen. 22. 18. Now although all Believers be-'ing the Seed of *Abraham* are blessed with Faithful *Abraham*; 'yet they are not *that Seed in whom* all Nations are Blessed; 'but *the Nations* who are blessed in *this Seed*. And in the very 'next Verse, the Covenant is said to be Established of God, 'εἰς Χριστὸν *in* or *unto* Christ, who is the *same Seed*, spoken of 'in the Preceding Verse. Now the Covenant is Confirmed in 'Christ Personal, not in Christ Mystical. Hence *Pareus* Con-'cludes it is to be understood, *Individuè de uno Christo ex quo* 'omnis Spiritualis Benedictio in fideles diffluit. But this also is 'to be observed, That Christ is given for a Covenant of the 'People, *Isa.* 42. 6. And therefore the Covenant is Established in 'him, and with him for all Believers. Mr. *Cox* in his Discourse 'of the Covenants, *pag.* 79, 80.

§. 2. And indeed throughout this whole Chapter of *Gal.* 3. where Christ is spoken of, it cannot be understood of Christ *Mystical*, but of Christ *Personal* onely: For so *Vers.* 13. *Christ* (saith he) *hath Redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us.* Is this to be understood of Christ Mystical, or Christ Personal onely? Did Christ Mystical Redeem us from the Curse of the Law? So likewise *Vers.* 14. *That the Blessing of* Abraham *might come on the* Gentiles *through Jesus Christ.* Is it through

through Christ Mystical that the Blessing of *Abraham* is there said to come on the *Gentiles?* Surely that cannot be the Sence; but through Christ Personal onely. In like manner therefore are we to understand him, *Vers.* 16. where he tells us, that *to* Abraham *and his Seed were the Promises made; he saith not unto Seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ.* Which is further plain from the very next following words, *Vers.* 17. *And this I say, that the Covenant that was Confirmed before of God in Christ, &c.* Which must of necessity be understood of Christ Personal onely: For as it is Christ alone that is given for a Covenant of the People: So it is by his Blood alone that all the Promises of the Gospel Covenant are Confirmed unto us. It is evident therefore that the Promises of the Gospel Covenant do all of them run to Christ the Inheriting Seed; to him they are made; In him do they all Center; And by him alone are they to be Communicated to all his Members. So that those words of the Apostle *Gal.* 3. 16. are unfitly applyed to *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. For as there is no Promise, nor the least hint of any Promise at all to Christ the Promised Seed, there mentioned or Recorded; And as that Covenant hath been plainly proved to be no other than a *Covenant of Works*, or a Legal Covenant, whereof Christ was not the Mediator: So it is as evident that those words of the Apostle have a direct and proper Reference to the *Gospel Covenant*, before mentioned, which had been long before made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. And which afterward was Solemnly Renewed and Confirmed unto him, *Gen.* 22. 17, 18. Whereof as Christ is the alone and onely Mediator: So he is the onely Seed therein spoken of, to whom the Promises are made, and in and by whom alone all the Families of the Earth are Blessed.

SECT. VIII.

THE Doctor indeed also tells us, That the Promise to *Abraham*, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed, &c.* is a Ratified Covenant, Confirmed by two Immutable things, by Word and Oath, in which it is Impossible for God to lie; and therefore cannot be dis-annulled. And if it be not dis-annulled (saith he) it is still in Being. And in being it

is, or we do but beat the Air, and are at a loss; Our Hope is in vain, and our Rejoycing in vain; which God forbid.

To this we Answer; That it is true, The Apostle tells us *Heb.* 6. 13. 14. That *when God made Promise to* Abraham, *because he could Swear by no greater he Sware by himself; Saying, Surely, in Blessing I will Bless thee, and Multiplying, I will Multiply thee*; *wherein* (saith he) Vers. 17. *God willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of Promise the Immutability of his Counsel, Confirmed it by an Oath, that by two Immutable things, wherein it is Impossible for God to lie, we might have strong Consolation, &c.* But what Promise is it that the Apostle here speaks of, which was thus Confirmed both by word and Oath? Was it the Promise or the Promises of the Covenant of Circumcision, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. *I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed, &c.* By no means: For that as hath been already proved was a Legal Covenant, and is therefore now done away. And besides we do not find any Oath at all affixed, or annexed thereunto for the Confirmation thereof; As neither had the Legal Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, for the Confirmation of that. But the Promise which the Apostle here speaks of, hath a plain Reference unto the Evangelical Covenant before mentioned; which was first made with *Abraham* before his Removal out of his own Country, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. which was afterward Repeated and Confirmed unto him by an Oath, *Gen.* 22. where God tells him, Vers. 16. 17, 18. *By my self have I Sworn* (*saith the Lord*) *that in Blessing I will Bless thee* (the same words the Apostle useth) *and in Multiplying I will Multiply thy Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea Shore. And thy Seed shall Possess the Gate of his Enemies. And in thy Seed shall All the Nations of the Earth be blessed*; which is a full and a plain Repetition of the Covenant which God first made with *Abraham Gen.* 12. 2, 3. Saying, *I will make of thee a great Nation, and I will Bless thee, and make thy Name great, and thou shalt be a Blessing. And I will Bless them that Bless thee, and Curse him that Curseth thee*; *And in thee shall all the Families of the Earth be Blessed.* In both which Scriptures we have a fair and full Recital of that truely Evangelical or Gospel Covenant, which God made with *Abraham*; And upon which all the Hope and Comfort of Believing *Gentiles* is firmly built and founded. And it is plain that this is the onely Covenant, which the Apostle speaks of, and as it were points with his Finger unto it, Reciting the very words and expressions of it (without taking any notice at all of the

the Covenant of Circumcision, or of any Expressions therein contained) as having been Confirmed before of God in Christ, *Gal.* 2. 17. And that as he here tells the *Hebrews*, *both by word and Oath, that by two Immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, there might be strong Consolation afforded unto all the Heirs of Promise.*

§. 2. No wonder therefore, that the Apostle tells us as he doth, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to* Abraham *and his Seed were* [*the Promises made*] not a single Promise onely, but the Promises: For as it is evident that there is a Plurality of Promises and Blessings contained in this Gospel Covenant, in reference to *Abraham*; The like we cannot but observe in reference to Christ himself the Promised Seed: Unto whom God doth not onely here Promise, That *in him should all the Nations of the Earth be blessed*: But also, That *he should Possess the Gate of his Enemies.* Both which are most full and Comprehensive Promises; And that as well in respect of the Blessings of this World, as of that which is to come. Upon which account it is highly observable, That as all the Promises, both of the one sort as well as of the other, do all run unto Christ the Inheriting Seed; so from and by him alone they are to be Communicated to all his Members: Forasmuch as he needs them not for himself. And therefore when God told *Abraham*, That *in his Seed should all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed*, as he doth therein promise to be our God, through Christ the Mediator; And by him to bless us with all *Spiritual Blessings*, by giving unto us *an Inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, which is reserved in Heaven for us*: So in like manner; When God tells *Abraham*, That *his Seed should Possess the Gate of his Enemies*, God doth herein Promise to give unto us, through Christ, the Blessings, even of *this World* also: For so it is Explained in Reference to Christ himself, *Psal.* 2. 1, 6, 7, 8. *Why do the Heathen rage? &c. Yet have I set my King upon my Holy Hill of* Sion. *I will declare the Decree: The Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the Earth for thy Possession.* To which same purpose we are also told, *Rev.* 11. 15. That *upon the Sounding of the Seventh Angel, there were Great Voices in Heaven, saying, The Kingdoms of this World are become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall Reign for ever and ever.* From both which we may clearly discern the

meaning of that Promiſe, That Chriſt ſhould *Poſſeſs the Gate of his Enemies*; Even that the Actual Soveraignty of the whole World ſhould at length be Committed unto him, as *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*. For which very purpoſe he now ſitteth at the Right Hand of God, *from henceforth expecting till his Enemies be made his Footſtool*, Heb. 10. 12, 13. which Promiſe; as it is plainly made unto Chriſt himſelf, ſo it is of mighty Conſequence unto his People alſo; Since upon the foot of this Promiſe depends all their happineſs in this World; As upon the other, their happineſs in that that is to come. For if Chriſt be Exalted in this World, ſo ſhall his People alſo. And if *the Kingdoms of this World* are to become *The Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Chriſt*, ſo alſo ſhall *the Kingdom and Dominion, and the greatneſs of the Kingdom and Dominion under the whole Heaven, be given to the People of the Saints of the moſt High*, Dan. 7. 27. So that ſince Chriſt is here promiſed, that *he ſhall Poſſeſs the Gate of his Enemies*; upon the ſame bottom, have his People ſufficient ground to expect that they ſhall *Poſſeſs the Gate of theirs* alſo: Foraſmuch as the ſame Bleſſedneſs that is Conferred upon the *Head*, ſhall in due Seaſon be derived to all his *Members*. And indeed for this Reaſon are all the Promiſes firſt made unto Chriſt himſelf, that he might have the ſingle Honour, in the Diſtribution of the Bleſſings therein Contained, among his Servants and followers, Rev. 5. 9, 10, 11, 12. *They ſung a New Song; Saying, Thou art Worthy to take the Book, and to open the Seals thereof: For thou waſt Slain, and haſt Redeemed us to God by thy Blood, out of every Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and Nation. And haſt made us unto our God, Kings and Prieſts; And we ſhall Reign upon the Earth. Therefore Worthy is the Lamb that was Slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wiſdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Bleſſing.*

SECT. IX.

MOreover, That the Goſpel Covenant before mentioned, and that alone, is the great Charter of the *Gentiles* hope, is yet further evident, from *Gal. 3. For the Scripture foreſeeing* (ſaith the Apoſtle, Verſ. 8) *that God would Juſtifie the Heathen through Faith, Preached before the Goſpel unto Abraham.* The Goſpel? What Goſpel? Was it the Promiſes contained in the Covenant

Covenant of Circumcision, wherein God promised *Abraham* that *he would be a God unto him, and to his Seed after him in their Generations?* By no means; For that was plainly a Covenant of Works, and concerned onely *Abraham*, and his *Natural* Posterity; which could yield no Comfort therefore to the *Heathen*. *But* (saith the Apostle) *the Scripture foreseeing that God would Justifie the Heathen through Faith* (that is, freely, and without the Works of the Law) *Preached before the Gospel unto* Abraham; *Saying, In thee shall all Nations be Blessed*; that is, in Christ, *the Promised Seed*. And this was indeed plain Gospel; A pure Evangelical Covenant; wholly free and Absolute; containing glad Tydings even unto the *Gentiles* also, as well as to the *Jews*; And in the very Language of the *Gospel Covenant* before Rehearsed out of *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. and *Gen.* 22. 17, 18. And not a word or Syllable of the Expression or terms of the *Covenant of Circumcision*; That being plainly a *Legal Covenant*, and the Promises therein Contained, bounded with *Conditions* impossible to be performed. And in this respect it is, that he speaks as he doth in what follows. *So then* (saith he, Vers. 9.) *they which are of Faith, are Blessed with Faithful Abraham*; still the Language of the Gospel Covenant. *They which are of Faith* (saith he) *are Blessed*. But how are they Blessed? Why they are Blessed as Faithful *Abraham* was Blessed: And how was that? Was it in the way of Faith or Works? In the way of Doing or Believing? Not in the Way of Doing; but in the way of Believing. And accordingly the Apostle tells us, *Rom.* 4. 13. That *the Promise that he should be the Heir of the World, was not to him, or to his Seed, through the Law; but through the Righteousness of Faith: For* (saith he, Vers. 14.) *If they which are of the Law, be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none Effect* —— *Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the Seed.* To which same purpose the Apostle further adds, *Vers.* 13, 14. of *Gal.* 3. That *as many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curse: For it is Written, Cursed is every one that Continueth not in all things that are Written in the Book of the Law, to do them: But Christ hath Redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us; That the Blessing of* Abraham *might come on the* Gentiles *through Jesus Christ.* The Reason of which last Clause, *through Jesus Christ*, He renders *Vers.* 16. to be, forasmuch as all the Promises of the Gospel Covenant, were first made unto Christ the Inheriting Seed, by and through whom alone they are to be Communicated to all his Members. *Now* (saith he) *to* Abraham,

and his Seed were the Promises made: He saith not, Unto Seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Christ. In all which we have the very words and Language, the Tenor and Terms (not of the *Covenant of Circumcision*; *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee in their Generations*; as it is there plainly expressed in the Plural Number; and restrained onely to Abrahams *Natural* Posterity; and that upon *Condition* of Obedience impossible to be performed; which was the *Tenor* of that Covenant: But) of the *Gospel Covenant*, before mentioned; which as it was every way free and *Absolute*, and therefore *sure* and certain to all the Seed therein concerned, *Rom.* 4. 13, 14. 15, 16. So it was as *Universally Extensible* through Christ the Promised Seed; taking in both *Jews* and *Gentiles*: For *in thy Seed* (saith God to *Abraham*) *shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed.* Wherein as Gods Heart and Mouth seems to be filled with *Blessings* through Christ, toward both *Abraham* himself, and all the Seed therein concerned: So doth the Apostle Recite the very same Expressions of *Blessing*, and *Blessedness*, over and over again, and that in the same *Evangelical* Style, pointing out unto us as with his Finger, what was that *Covenant* from whence all the *Blessedness* he speaks of, was to descend upon the *Gentiles*; which therefore is Represented unto us as the great Charter of the *Gentiles* hope; and which being Confirmed as it is, and that both by Word and Oath, shall therefore never be dis-annulled.

§. 2. 'Tis true, the Covenant of Circumcision is called also *an Everlasting Covenant*: But that can be understood in no other sense, than that wherein the Priest-hood of *Aaron* and his Sons, under the Law, was called *an Everlasting Priest-hood*, Exod. 40. 15. which yet we know to be now Abolished. And as likewise the Covenant made with *Phineas* was called *the Covenant of an Everlasting Priest-hood*, Numb. 25. 13. which yet is now also done away; being onely intended during the Continuance of the then present Administration. [For as Mr. *Pool* tells us, the word *Olam*, rendered *for ever*, doth not always signifie Eternity: But a long Continuance; as is evident (saith he) from *Gen.* 17. 13. and *Exod.* 21. 16.] And thus was it in respect of the Covenant of Circumcision; which forasmuch as it was not Confirmed both by Word and Oath, as the Gospel Covenant made with *Abraham* was; and forasmuch as Circumcision it self, which was the very Sign and Token of it, is now Repealed; and more especially forasmuch as though God did indeed promise to *Establish his Covenant between*

him

him and them, for an Everlasting Covenant; yet still it was, provided they *kept his Covenant*, and fulfilled the *Condition* thereof on their part; in which respect it was as much a *Covenant of Works*, as any of the other Covenants were, that have been before Discoursed of: From hence it inevitably follows, that it is now revoked and done away, *Acts* 15. 24. *Col.* 2. 14. *Heb.* 8. 7. 13. whereas the *Gospel Covenant*, being every way Free and Absolute, it is therefore unchangeably sure and certain, to all the Seed thereunto belonging, as it is expressly affirmed by the Apostle, *Rom.* 4. 13. 14. 15. 16. And as it had been for the same Reason before asserted by the Prophet *David*, 2 *Sam.* 23. 5. and by God himself, *Isa.* 55. 1, 3.

SECT. X.

BUT whereas we are told 'That *it must needs have occasioned many clamours among the Jews, and have been a great Bar against their Reception of the Gospel; had they been told that the Covenant they so much trusted in was now repealed, and their Seed cast out of the Church.* It is manifest to those whose Eyes are open, that the Repeal of the *Covenant of Circumcision* (which the *Jews* could not but sufficiently understand by the Removal of the very *Sign* and *Token* of it) did indeed occasion no small Dissatisfaction unto them; as is evident from sundry places in the *Acts*, as well as also in the Epistle to the *Galatians*. More particularly, *Acts* 21. 20, 21. where *James* and the rest of the Elders present, tell *Paul*; *That many thousands of the Jews which believed, and were all zealous of the Law, had been informed of him, that he had taught all the Jews which were among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying, That they ought not to Circumcise their Children, neither to walk after the Customs.* And it is plain, that he had taught this Doctrine unto them, which had occasioned no small Dissention among them. For to this same purpose he expressly tells the *Galatians*, Chap. 5. 2. 3. 4. *Behold, I Paul, say unto you, That if you be Circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing: For I testifie again, to every man that is Circumcised, That he is a Debtor to do the whole Law; Christ is become of no Effect unto you: whosoever of you are justified by the Law, you are fallen from Grace.* From whence, as we may clearly

ly discern the *Nature* of the Covenant of Circumcision; that it was no other than a Covenant of Works, or a Legal Covenant, which he doth herein so plainly declare unto them to be now Repealed: So it doth as plainly appear, that from hence it came to pass, that Christ became so great an *Offence* unto the *Jews*, and the Gospel so sore a *Stone of Stumbling, and Rock of Offence* unto them all; yea to many of them after they had submitted to the Gospel: Yea, the Gentile-Churches themselves, were scarce, if at all, preserved from stumbling hereat with the *Jews*, (as appears from what the Apostle writes to the *Galatians* upon this Subject;) though all this loss and change of State and Priviledges which they so much repined at, well considered, would amount to no more than what befalls a man, who from the Priviledges of a *Servant*, is invested into the Priviledges of a *Son*. And this was the very Case, Gal. 4. 4. *God hath sent forth his Son*, &c. vers. 5. *to Redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons*: vers. 7. *Wherefore thou art no more a Servant, but a Son*; as hath been before at large explained. Neither indeed doth the present Alteration, or Change of State, occasion any Real or Substantial Loss unto the *Children* of Believers, any more than to *themselves*; but much of Spiritual Advantage rather to *both*, as hath been already discovered in the foregoing part of this Discourse.

§. 2. And indeed, what needed the *Jews* to have been so much startled, or offended at the Abolishing of *Circumcision*, as they were; if they had not plainly discerned that it toucht their Main Copy hold, or the *Covenant* it self, they so much Gloried in, and Boasted of, *Mat.* 3. 9. *Joh.* 8. 33. to which *Circumcision* was annexed; and that the taking away of the *One*, was a plain Sign of the Abrogation of the *Other* also? Else they had no Pretence, or Shadow of Reason to make the Clamours they did: For if they had understood, that the *Covenant it self* had remained entire, and only the *Signs* changed: Or had *Paul* told them, their Children should be Baptized, and that Baptism was come into the room of *Circumcision*; (which had been absolutely necessary if it had been so) In all likelihood, they had quietly submitted to the present Alteration: But this was plainly therefore the ground of their Quarrel; for that the *Covenant it self* was now broken down; which they could not but understand by the Removal of the very *Sign* and Token thereof; from whence they could not but conclude, that their so long enjoyed Priviledge of Church-membership

ſhip for themſelves and Children alſo, upon the bare account that *Abraham* was their Father, was now Abolliſhed, *Mat.* 3. 9.

SECT. XI.

MOreover, That the Goſpel Covenant before mentioned, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. and *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18. is the only ground of the *Gentiles* hope, and indeed of the *Jews* alſo: The Apoſtle *Peter* likewiſe doth plainly declare unto us; when he tells the *Jews* that were *pricked in their Hearts*, for their Crucifying of Chriſt, as he doth, Acts 2. 38, 39. *Repent and be Baptized, every one of you, in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the Remiſſion of Sins, and you ſhall Receive the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt. For the Promiſe is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* Where by the Promiſe unto them, and to their Children; we are not to underſtand the *Covenant of Circumciſion*: For though God did therein promiſe *to be a God to* Abraham, *and to his Seed*; which was indeed a moſt Bleſſed and Comfortable Promiſe in it ſelf conſidered, and contains in it the Sum of all our Bleſſedneſs: But how ſhould they come at it? It is fenced about with a *Flaming Sword*, or a *Fiery Burning Law, that ſurrounds every Way, to keep the Way to the Tree of Life.* To inſiſt therefore upon *that* Covenant, or *that* Promiſe, as it is thus *Bounded*, will afford no *Relief*; For according to *that Covenant* they muſt be *Circumciſed*, and *keep the Whole Law*, Act. 15. 1. 5. Gal. 5. 3. which is impoſſible to be performed, *Gal.* 3. 10, 11, 12. And therefore how Sweet, or Full, or Glorious ſoever, the *Promiſe* is, in it ſelf Conſidered; yet it is impoſſible (*bounded as it is*) that ever they ſhould come to obtain the Benefit of it: Which therefore could be no Proper Remedy for the Eaſe of their preſent Miſery, or the Removal of their preſent Perplexity. And therefore inſtead of directing them to *that Covenant*; he plainly directs them to *another*, full of *Grace and Truth*, even the *Goſpel Covenant* before-mentioned: *For the Promiſe* (faith he) *is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* Plainly pointing to the Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. long before the Covenant of Circumciſion was in being; and which was afterward renewed unto

to

to him, *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18. Even that *Ratified* Covenant; That *Free* and *Absolute* Covenant, which had been confirmed *both by Word and Oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie; there might be strong Consolation afforded unto all the Heirs of Promise.* And that *this* is the Covenant that he directs them to, and not the *Covenant of Circumcision*, is evident from the words themselves: For the *Promise* he speaks of, was not only *unto them, and to their Children: But unto all that are afar off* (as *Paul* tells the *Ephesians*, Chap. 2. 12.) *Even unto the* Gentiles *also, as many as the Lord our God shall call.* Which Promise unto the *Gentiles*, is not to be found in the *Covenant of Circumcision*: For that was made unto *Abraham*, and his *Natural* Posterity only; whereby they were Obliged unto *Circumcision*, and to *keep the whole Law*; and not a word of the *Gentiles* there: For it is plain, that as God there promiseth *to be a God unto* Abraham, *and to his Seed*: So the same Seed that are concerned in the *Promises* there mentioned, were also Commanded to be *Circumcised*. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee in their Generations*, verf. 9. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee: Every man-child among you shall be Circumcised*, Gen. 17. 10. The same Seed therefore that is the Subject of the *Promises*, verf. 7, 8. is the Subject of the *Obligation*, verf. 9, 10. So that it is evident, that the *Gentiles* are not at all concerned in *that* Covenant, as being no way concerned in *Circumcision*, the *Condition* thereof. The *Promise* therefore that *Peter* intends, must needs be the *Free Promise*, or the *Gospel Covenant* before mentioned: Whereof as Christ is the Alone, and Only *Mediator*: So he is also the only Seed therein immediately concerned: From, and by whom all Gospel Blessings must be derived unto all his Spiritual Offspring. And in *this* Covenant the *Gentiles* are indeed concerned as well as the *Jews*: For therein *all the Kindreds, Families, and Nations of the Earth*, are promised *to be Blessed*; even in Christ the *Promised Seed*. And therefore well might the Apostle tell them as he doth, That the Promise he now spake of to them, was not only *to them, and to their Children*, but *to all that were afar off* also; *even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* For so *Paul* tells the *Galatians* also; That *Christ hath Redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, that the Blessing of* Abraham *might come on the* Gentiles, *through Jesus Christ*, Gal. 3. 13, 14. Not upon the *Jews* only, but the *Gentiles* also.

§. 2.

§. 2. And that this is the Gospel Covenant that *Peter* here Preacheth unto these Bleeding *Jews*, is yet further evident, from what he tells them in *Chap.* 3. 25, 26. *You* (saith he there) *are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers; saying unto* Abraham, *And in thy Seed shall all the Kindreds of the Earth be blessed; unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* Where we have the very Words and Terms of the Gospel Covenant recited, as it was at first made with *Abraham*, Gen. 12. 2, 3. and Gen. 22. 16, 17, 18. *You* (saith he) *are the Children of the Covenant.* What Covenant? Doth he mean the Covenant of Circumcision, in which God Promised *Abraham*; saying, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy Seed after thee*, upon Condition, that thou and they be Circumcised, &c. No, saith *Peter*, I do not mean that Covenant; but *the Covenant which God made with our Fathers; saying unto* Abraham, *And in thy Seed shall all the Kindreds of the Earth be Blessed.* The Covenant of *Circumcision* concerned your *selves* alone, and was plainly *Conditional*, and therefore *failable.* But the Covenant that I speak to you of, is a *Free* Covenant, Sure and Certain; and that which concerns not *you alone*, but *all the Kindreds of the Earth.* Wherein we are du'y to observe, that instead of directing them to the Covenant of Circumcision made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. (whereof there is not the least Word or Syllable expressed in *Peter's* present words to the *Jews*, nor in all the New Testament besides; that being no other than a Bondage Covenant, *Gal.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4 *Acts* 15. 1, 5, 10. as the Covenant at *Sinai* was; and so no Proper Remedy for the Removal of their Present Miseries) he rather directs them to that most Comfortable Promise, first mentioned, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. And afterward by Solemn Oath Confirmed, *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18. That *in* Abrahams *Seed should all the Kindreds of the Earth be Blessed.* And this was home to the Point; it being both a *free* and a *full* Promise; and, therefore an Answerable *Remedy* for their present *Malady*: For if God hath *freely* promised that in Christ (who is *Abraham's* Seed) *all the Kindreds of the Earth shall be Blessed*: Why then there is ground of hope for *you*; even for *you also*, though you have been *the Betrayers and Murderers of the Lord of Glory*: And not only is there ground of hope for you, but even for your Children also, on whom, as well as on your selves, you have wished his Blood to be: And accordingly he

P. eaches

Preaches Christ unto them in the very next words; *Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities*; wherein we are to note, That as the *Gospel* Covenant is a Covenant of *Blessings*; full of *Blessings*; Heaps upon Heaps of *Blessings*; Innumerable *Blessings*. *I will Bless thee*, (saith God to *Abraham*) *and thou shalt be a Blessing*: *I will Bless them that Bless thee*: And again, *Surely, in Blessing, I will Bless thee*; *and in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed*: So in pursuance of the same *Evangelical* Promise, and Covenant of *Blessing* (saith *Peter* here) *God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to Bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities*: Wherein that which was required before as a *Condition*, is now become a Main Branch of the *Promised Blessing*: For before *the Promise was unto them that turn from Transgression in* Jacob: *But God* (saith he) *hath sent his Son Jesus to Bless you, by turning away ungodliness from* Jacob; *even in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*

§. 3. It is undeniaby evident therefore, that *Peter*, instead of directing them to the *Covenant of Circumcision*, for their present Relief, He rather directs both them and theirs to have recourse to that *Evangelical* Covenant, which God had made with their Fathers; *saying unto* Abraham, *And in thy Seed shall all the Kindreds of the Earth be Blessed*: For this, as it was every way *full* and *extensive*; so it was as *free* and *absolute*: And therefore the most Proper *Remedy* for the Relief of their Wounded Spirits: Whereas had he directed them to the Promises contained in the Covenant of Circumcision, that had left them still in *Despair*; for that obliged them to Perfect Obedience, as the *Condition* of obtaining the Mercies therein Promised, which was impossible to be Performed. To tell them therefore of the Promises contained in *that* Covenant, was altogether beside his present *Design*; which was to give Relief to their *Wounded Spirits*, which the Promises of *that* Covenant, thus *Bounded* as they were, could never Accomplish.

SECT. XII.

SECT. XII.

AND whereas *Peter* tells the *Jews*, That *the Promiſe was unto them, and to their Children.* We are not to underſtand it, as if the *Goſpel Covenant* that Believers are now under, was at all made with *Abraham, and his Natural Seed*; and conſequently with *them and their Natural Seed*: Or that any of the Promiſes thereof were *immediately* made unto him, as the Promiſes contained in the *Covenant of Circumciſion* were. In which reſpect it is highly obſervable, that as the Spirit of God himſelf doth plainly inform us of a twofold Covenant made with *Abraham*; the one a Covenant of *Grace*, and the other of *Works*: So he is pleaſed accordingly alſo to make a plain diſtinction between them, as to the *Perſons*, or *Parties*, therein reſpectively concerned. For if we look into *Gen.* 12. We ſhall there find, that the former is made between God and *Abraham only*; and that with reſpect unto his Seed Chriſt, and his Spiritual Offering: Whereas the latter is plainly made between God and *Abraham* and his *Natural Poſterity*. The firſt account which the Scripture gives us of the former, we meet with (as hath been before noted) *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. Where the Lord is pleaſed to enter into a Solemn Covenant with *Abraham*; ſaying, *I will make of thee a great Nation; and I will Bleſs thee, and make thy Name great; and thou ſhalt be a Bleſſing: And I will Bleſs them that Bleſs thee, and I will Curſe him that Curſeth thee: And in thee ſhall all the Families of the Earth be Bleſſed.* To the ſame purpoſe alſo the Lord tells *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 2. *I will make my Covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly*; verſ. 3. *And* Abraham *fell on his Face, and God talked with him, ſaying, As for me, behold my Covenant is with thee, and thou ſhalt be a Father of many Nations; neither ſhall thy Name any more be called* Abram, *but thy Name ſhall be called* Abraham: *For a Father of many Nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make Nations of thee, and Kings ſhall come out of thee.* Which is a plain Tranſcript, or Reheartal of the ſeveral Free Promiſes of the Goſpel Covenant, that God had before made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. *Gen.* 15. 5, 6. which are here gathered up together, and plainly Repreſented unto him, under the denomination of a *Covenant*, and ſuch

a Co-

a Covenant as God had made with *Abraham himself alone*, not with his *Natural Offspring*. For saith God, verſ. 2. *I will make my Covenant between me and thee*: And verſ. 4. *As for me, behold my Covenant is with thee, and thou ſhalt be a Father of many Nations; neither ſhall thy Name any more be called* Abram, *but* Abraham, *for a Father of many Nations have I made thee.* So that this Covenant could have relation to *no other*; it being no way *applicable* to any other Perſon whatſoever, whether *Iſaac* or *Jacob*, or any elſe of his Natural Offspring, to be *Father of many Nations*; or as the Apoſtle explains it, *The Father of all them that Believe*, as *Abraham* was; his Prerogative herein being ſingular, and incommunicable to any elſe. Whereas the *Covenant of Circumciſion* was as plainly made between God and *Abraham*, and *his Natural Seed alſo*; as *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. declare. *And* (ſaith God, *verſ.* 7. Or, *Moreover*, as 'tis in the Old Tranſlation, as proceeding to ſpeak of another Covenant, than what he had been before inſiſting on) *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations, for an everlaſting Covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee*: verſ. 8. *And I will give unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a Stranger; all the Land of* Canaan *for an Everlaſting Poſſeſſion; and I will be their God*: verſ. 9. *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations*: verſ. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee; every Manchild among you ſhall be Circumciſed.*

§. 2. So that though the Promiſes of the Covenant of Circumciſion were indeed made unto *Abraham*, and his Natural Seed alſo; yet the Promiſes of the Goſpel Covenant, we ſee were not, and the Apoſtle expreſly diſowns it, Gal. 3. 16. *Now to* Abraham, *and his Seed were the Promiſes made; he ſaith not, And to Seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Chriſt.* For though God doth indeed tell *Abraham*, Gen. 12. 7. *Unto thy Seed will I give this Land*: And Gen. 13. 15. *All the Land which thou ſeeſt, to thee will I give it, and to thy Seed for ever*: And Gen. 15. 18. *In that ſame day the Lord made a Covenant with* Abraham; *ſaying, Unto thy Seed, have I given this Land, from the River of* Egypt, *unto the Great River, the River* Euphrates. Which are all plainly *Goſpel* Promiſes, and made unto *Abraham* long before the Covenant of *Circumciſion* was made with him, and therefore a part of the *free Promiſe*, or the *Covenant of Promiſe*,

miſe, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, *Gal.* 3. 17, 18. Yet by *Seed*, in all theſe Promiſes, we are plainly to underſtand no other than *Chriſt himſelf*: For ſo it is explained to our hands, not only in Gal. 3. 16. but alſo Gen. 22. 16, 17. *By my ſelf have I ſworn (ſaith the Lord) that in Bleſſing, I will Bleſs thee; and in Multiplying, I will multiply thy Seed as the Stars of the Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea ſhore: And thy Seed ſhall poſſeſs the Gate of his Enemies*: Expreſly in the ſingular number; not the Gate of *their* Enemies, but the Gate of *his* Enemies. And accordingly it follows, verſ. 18. *And in thy Seed ſhall all the Nations of the Earth be Bleſſed*; Which muſt of neceſſity be underſtood of *Chriſt* alone. And whereas Chriſt is here Promiſed, That *he ſhall Poſſeſs the Gate of his Enemies*; It is plainly Synonimous, or of the ſame ſignification with the forementioned Promiſes; *Unto thy Seed will I give this Land*, Gen. 12. 6. *And all the Land which thou ſeeſt, unto thee will I give it, and to thy Seed for ever*, Gen. 13. 15. For *to* Abraham *and his Seed* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *were the Promiſes made*: *He ſaith not, And to Seeds, as of many; but as of one; And to thy Seed, which is Chriſt.* And ſo again, Gen. 15. 18. *Unto thy Seed have I given this Land, from the River of Egypt, unto the Great River, the River* Euphrates: Which is by the Pſalmiſt moſt plainly applied to *Chriſt*, in the Perſon of *Solomon*, Pſal. 72. 8, 9. *He ſhall have Dominion alſo from Sea to Sea, and from the River unto the ends of the Earth. They that dwell in the Wilderneſs ſhall bow before him, and his Enemies ſhall lick the Duſt. The Kings of* Tarſhiſh, *and of the Iſles, ſhall bring Preſents. The Kings of* Sheba *and* Seba *ſhall offer Gifts; yea, all Kings ſhall fall down before him; all Nations ſhall ſerve him.* Where we have a clear Paraphraſe upon the Promiſes made to *Abraham* and to his Seed; when he was told, *All the Land which thou ſeeſt, to thee will I give it, and to thy Seed for ever: And thy Seed ſhall Poſſeſs the Gate of his Enemies.* For as much as God hath by Promiſe given both unto *Abraham*, and unto his Seed Chriſt alſo, all thoſe *Countreys* now *poſſeſſed by his Enemies*; which we ſee is by the Pſalmiſt interpreted, not only as having relation to *Canaan*, but unto his Univerſal Dominion over all the Earth. For Chriſt is here promiſed, not only that *he ſhall have Dominion from Sea to Sea* (or as God told *Abraham*, *from the River of* Egypt, *to the Great River, the River* Euphrates) but *from the River to the ends of the Earth: That they that dwell in the Wilderneſs ſhall bow before him, and his Enemies ſhall lick the Duſt: That the Kings of* Tarſhiſh, *and of the Iſles, ſhall bring*

Presents: The *Kings* of Sheba, *and* Seba *shall offer Gifts*; *yea, all Kings shall fall down before him, and all Nations shall serve him.* And accordingly he concludes, verſ. 18, 19. *Bleſſed be the Lord God, the God of* Iſrael, *who only doth wondrous things*; *and bleſſed be his Glorious Name for ever*: *And let the whole Earth be filled with his Glory*; Amen *and* Amen.

§. 3. The Promiſes of the *Goſpel Covenant* made with *Abraham*, therefore, we ſee, do all of them run directly to *Chriſt* the inheriting Seed: To him they are made: In him do they Center: And from him alone, all the Bleſſings in Promiſe are derived unto all his *Spiritual Offspring*, Gal. 3. 29. *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye* Abrahams *Seed, and Heirs according to the Promiſe.* And therefore though God doth indeed Promiſe in this Goſpel Covenant, to *multiply* Abrahams *Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea ſhore*, Gen. 22. 17. (which we are to underſtand, no doubt, in reference to *Abraham's Natural* Offspring, as well as of thoſe Multitudes, that in all Nations were to become his *Spiritual Seed* by believing, *Gen.* 15. 5. *Rom.* 4. 17, 18. In which reſpect *Peter* tells the *Jews*, Act. 3. 25. *Ye are the Children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers*; *ſaying unto* Abraham, *And in thy Seed ſhall all the Kindreds of the Earth be bleſſed.*) Yet there is not a word of bleſſing therein *immediately* Pronounced; either upon *Abraham's Natural* Offspring; or thoſe that in all Nations were to become his Seed by *Believing*: All the Bleſſings being reſerved for the *Firſt-born among many Brethren*, Pſal. 89. 27, 28, 29. Rom. 8. 29. who is therefore repreſented unto us as *the Heir of all things*, Heb. 1. 2. Even Chriſt the *Promiſed Seed*, Gal. 3. 18, 19. To whom *the Promiſes were made*, Gal. 3. 16. And who muſt therefore have the ſingle Honour and Prerogative concerning the Diſtribution of all the Bleſſings therein Promiſed, among his Members, Children, and Brethren, *Iſa.* 49. 6, 8, 9. *Joh.* 1. 16, 17. *Joh.* 6. 27. *Gal.* 3. 29.

§. 4. 'Tis true, God pronounced a *Bleſſing* upon *Iſaac*, and upon *Jacob* alſo, who were *Abraham's Natural* Offspring, as well as his *Spiritual Seed*, by Believing. And accordingly we find God ſpeaking to *Iſaac*, Gen. 26. 3, 4. *Sojourn in this Land, and I will be with thee, and will Bleſs thee*: *For unto thee, and unto thy Seed will I give thoſe Countreys*: *And I will perform the Oath which I ſware unto* Abraham *thy Father*: *And I will make thy Seed*

Seed to multiply as the Stars of Heaven. And I will give unto thy Seed all these Countreys: And in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed. I will Bless thee (saith God to *Isaac*,) But how? No otherwise than as the *Gentiles* are Blessed; that is, through Christ the Promised Seed, *in whom all the Nations of the Earth are Blessed*, Gal. 3. 8, 14. For it cannot be imagined that the Gospel Blessing should be derived to any of *Abraham's Natural* Offspring *one way*, and to Believing *Gentiles another*: But they must all, both the *one* as well as the *other*, be beholding to Christ for the Blessing, if ever they have it: For if all the Nations of the Earth are Blessed in Christ; then the *Jews* as well as the *Gentiles*, must all of them, if at all, be Blessed that way also, *Gal.* 3 29.

§. 5. In the Covenant of Circumcision indeed God promiseth *Abraham*, to be a God, not only to him, *but to his Seed after him*, in their Generations; meaning his *Natural* Offspring; wherein a Blessing is *immediately* pronounced upon them all: But that was only upon *Condition of their Obedience*: As was also that at *Sinai*; *which Covenant they brake, they Continued not in it, and God regarded them not*, Heb. 8. 8, 9. And both being of the same Stamp made with the same People, and making up one and the same *Old Covenant*; it is therefore now Abolished, *Heb.* 7. 18. *Heb.* 8. 13. *Coll.* 2. 14. So that that could not be the *Promise* that *Peter* speaks of. How are we then to understand those words of *Peter* before mentioned, *The Promise is unto you, and to your Children?* Why, plainly thus, Though the *Conditional* Covenant of Circumcision is now done away: So that you have no further pretence, or Plea of *that* kind left you: And though the Promises of the *Gospel* Covenant do all of them run directly to *Christ*, the Promised Seed; yet still he might justly enough assure them that *the Promise was to them, and to their Children also*: Because God had therein promised that *in* Abraham's *Seed*, that is, in Christ, *All the Families of the Earth should be Blessed*. And upon this Bottom there was sufficient ground of Comfort, not only for the *Jews*, and *their Children*; But for the *Gentiles* also, that were *afar off*; *even as many as the Lord our God shall call*: this being a most full and comprehensive Promise; every way free and absolute; and therefore Ministring Suitable Relief, even unto the *Jews themselves*, that had been *the Betrayers and Murderers of the Lord of Glory*; yea and unto *their Children* also, on whom, as well as on themselves, *they had wished his Blood to be*:

And therefore though the Original Grant, or Promise was not made unto them, or their Children; or to any others *immediately*; yet at Second-hand Rate, at least, it did sufficiently appertain both unto them and their Children also: For, saith he, Acts 3. 26. *God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to Bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* Which he doth immediately subjoyn upon his Rehearsal of the forementioned General Promise, that *in* Abraham's *Seed should all the Kindreds of the Earth be Blessed; Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to Bless you*, &c. Whereby as *Peter* doth sufficiently intimate, that the Promise was both unto them and their Children also; so that God would no longer deal with them *immediately*, as he had done in the Covenant of *Circumcision*, and in the *Legal* Covenant made with their Fathers at *Sinai*; or by any *meerly Humane Mediator* whatsoever, as then: But they must expect all their Blessings *now* at the hand of *Christ*: For (saith he) *God hath sent him to Bless you*, &c And so likewise, Act. 5. 31. *Him hath God exalted with his own Right hand to be Prince and a Saviour, for to give Repentance unto* Israel, *and the forgiveness of Sins.* Hands off therefore from the *Old* Covenant; whether that in *Moses* his time, or the *Covenant of Circumcision* in *Abraham*'s time: For *God is a Consuming Fire*, and there is no dealing with him at that Rate any longer; but through the *Mediation* of Christ alone; *who hath obtained a more Excellent Ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a Better Covenant which is established upon better Promises.*

SECT. XIV.

SECT. XIII.

FOR a Concluſion therefore of the preſent Point; It is obſervable, that as the forementioned Covenants, both that mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. as well as thoſe mentioned, *Gen.* 2. *Exod.* 19. *Exod.* 20. and *Deut.* 29. were all *Conditional*, and therefore *Legal* Covenants; requiring ſtrict and perfect Obedience, as the *Condition* propounded, in order to the Enjoyment of the Mercies Contained in them: Which are all of them therefore *done away in Chriſt.* So on the other hand, we ſee that the Covenant that God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 12. 2, 3. *Gen.* 17. 2, 3, 4. and *Gen.* 22. 16, 17, 18. was wholly *Free*, and *Abſolute*, and therefore purely *Evangelical*, and that which never ſhall be *diſannulled*, being Confirmed both *by Word and Oath*; and conſequently *ſure* to all the Seed therein concerned. For as therein God hath *Abſolutely* promiſed, that in Chriſt the Promiſed Seed *all the Nations of the Earth ſhall be Bleſſed* (which according to the whole Current of the Scriptures muſt of neceſſity be limitted to the Elect, or the true Believers of all Nations, that all that ſhall be bleſſed, ſhall be bleſſed by this means, and no other way:) So leſt it ſhould be ſuſpected that any *Condition* ſhould ſtart up, whereby they might either be hindered from *obtaining* the Promiſed Bleſſing, or *forfeit* it when in Poſſeſſion thereof; we are therefore alſo told, that *God having raiſed up his Son* Jeſus, *hath ſent him to Bleſs us by turning away every one of us from his Iniquities.* And it is as plain that of the ſame Nature and *Tenor* is the Covenant mentioned, *Deut.* 30. 6. As was alſo the Covenant which God made with *Noah*, *Gen.* 9. 9, 10, 11. As alſo thoſe mentioned, *Jer.* 31. 31, 32, 33. *Jer.* 32. 38, 39, 40. *Ezek.* 36. 25, 26, 27. *Heb.* 8. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. For as God Promiſeth to the *Iſraelites*, Deut. 30. 6. *That he will Circumciſe their Heart, and the Heart of their Seed to Love the Lord their God with all their Heart, and with all their Soul, that they might live*: So in *Jer.* 31. *Jer.* 32. and *Heb.* 8. the Lord there alſo promiſeth unto the Houſe of *Iſrael*, and to the Houſe of *Judah*, *after thoſe Days, to put his Law in their Inward parts, and to Write it in their Hearts; and that as he will not turn away from them to do them good, ſo neither ſhall they depart from him*, &c. Wherein, as well as in

the *Gospel* Covenant before mentioned, which the Believing *Gentiles* are now under; the terms are not *Conditional* or *failable*; I will, if ye will: But *Absolute* and *Soveraign*; *I will*, and *ye shall*. So that that which God had before required, as the *Condition* of the Covenant of Works, and was not before *Promised*; is now become a main *Branch* of the Covenant of *Promise* it self.

§. 2. And therefore, when the Apostle tells us, *Gal.* 3. 21. That *if there had been a Law given, that could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law*; from hence it appears, that the Gospel Covenant doth more for us, than the Legal did: For it giveth *Life*, and then Enables to the *performance* of that which it requireth of us; whereas from what the Apostle there tells us, it appears that the Legal Covenant did not give Life, and that it failed because it was *Conditional*. The Law indeed *shews* us our Duty, but gives no *strength* to perform it. The Gospel Covenant doth both, by *Writing the Law in the Heart*. Hence it is truely and properly a Covenant of *Grace*, as not depending at all upon *Works*: *For if it be of Works, then it is no more Grace; otherwise Work is no more Work*, Rom. 11. 6. *And if by Grace, then it is no more of Works: Otherwise Grace is no more Grace*. And therefore Christ is said to have obtained a more Excellent Ministry than that of *Moses*, *by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which is Established upon better Promises*, Heb. 8. 6. 'Tis true the Promises for the *Substance* of them (as hath been before observed) are the same as before; *I will be their God, and they shall be my People*. But now the terms are altered: For whereas before it depended upon the *Works of our Obedience*; Now *Faith alone* is required in order to the *receiving*; and consequently in order to our *participation* of them. Thus *Paul* directs the Jaylor. *Believe on the Lord* Jesus Christ, *and thou shalt be saved*, Acts 16. 31. So Rom. 4. 5. *To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his Faith is Counted for Righteousness*. And in like manner the Apostle tells us, Gal. 3. 22. *That the Scripture hath Concluded all under Sin, that the Promise by Faith of* Jesus Christ *might be given to them that Believe*. Not that Believing is the *Condition* of the Promise, (as 'tis generally Asserted) but a *Designation* rather of the Persons to whom the Promise is given; that is, to *Believers*; or a *Declaration* of the Way, in which the Promise is given, that is in a way of *Believing*. For indeed Faith

is

is not the *Condition*, but the *Fruit* of the Promise: For if it be the *Condition*; either it must be *wrought by us* of our selves; Or it must be *given us of God*. If it be to be wrought by our selves; Then is the Promise of Grace worse and harder than the Covenant of *Works* which God made with our First Parent: For though it was required of *Adam* to *do and live*; yet he had then *a Power of Doing*; But so have not we of *Believing*: Yea no more was required of him than was put into his *Nature*: For the Covenant of Works was Written in his *Nature*; but so is not Faith in *ours*. If it be given us of God (as the Scripture doth plainly affirm it is, Eph. 2. 8. *For by Grace are ye saved through Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the Gift of God*) then it is given by vertue of some *Promise*: For God gives nothing but by vertue of some *Promise*; which Promise can be no other than the Free *Promise*, the Promise of *Grace*: From whence it plainly follows, that the Covenant of Grace is wholly free and *Absolute*; Since Faith it self is the *Fruit*, and therefore cannot be the *Condition* thereof.

§. 3. So that the Material Difference between the Covenant of Grace and that of Works, Consisteth in the Different *Terms* of either: The one being *Conditional*, the other free and *Absolute*. Not that we are therefore discharged from *Duty* under the *Gospel*: For as the Apostle tells us by way of Answer to the same Objection, Rom. 3. 31. *Do we then make void the Law through Faith? God forbid, yea we Establish the Law.* Because that Obedience which was before, the Obedience of Servants, and Slaves, is now become Filial, or Son like; Not for Life, as under the Legal Covenant: but from a Principle of Life already received, which Powerfully Constraineth, and Effectually Enableth unto the Love, and Service of God, 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. 15. *Tit.* 2. 11, 12. *Tit.* 3. 8. It is certain therefore, that Working is required under the Covenant of Grace, as much as under the Covenant of Works it self: But not for the same *purpose*, nor from the same *Principle*. Not for the same *Purpose*; forasmuch as no Works of any kind whatsoever, as done or Performable by us, are at all designed as the matter of our *Justification* before Gods Presence, under the Gospel Covenant, *Rom.* 3. 20. *Tit.* 3. 5. though they were so propounded under the Legal, *Rom.* 10. 5. Nor from the same *Principle*: Forasmuch as Good Works are not Previous to Faith, but the Consequent of it: That being the onely Principle from whence all true Gospel Obedience flows, *Heb.* 11. 4 5, 6, *&c.*

SECT. XIV.

§. 1. HAving therefore, we hope, Subſtantially proved that the Covenant of Circumciſion, which God made with *Abraham*, and his Natural Poſterity, mentioned *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9, 10. was no other than a Covenant of Works; As alſo that the Covenant mentioned *Deut.* 29. wherein the *Jews* and their little ones were Concerned, was of the ſame ſtamp; as well as that made at Mount *Sinai*, mentioned *Exod.* 19. 5. and *Exod.* 20. All which were but ſeveral Repetitons of the Covenant of Works made with our Firſt Parent; And therefore called *the Old, or the Firſt Covenant*, *Heb.* 8: 7, 13. And foraſmuch as 'tis as plain and evident, that they are all of them done away in Chriſt, as hath been already proved: From hence therefore, it unavoidably follows, that all the Arguments for the Support of Infants Church Membership and Baptiſm under the Goſpel, which are founded upon the like Priviledges granted unto the Natural Poſterity of *Abraham*, under the former Adminiſtration; do of themſelves fall to the ground: Foraſmuch as the Covenants themſelves, which thoſe Priviledges were then Bottomed upon, are now Repealed. Neither is there any Room left for any other or further Argument from either of thoſe forementioned Covenants, to Infer the Baptiſm of Infants: The Obligation upon Believers Concerning the Goſpel Sign, being wholly left unto the time of its Inſtitution; which determines both the Duties and the Subjects thereof, to the Excluſion of Infants; as hath been before abundantly proved.

§. 2. But whereas it is Objected; That ſince according to the Scope of the foregoing Diſcourſe, every Conditional Covenant is a Covenant of Works: From whence 'tis Inferred, that ſuch was the Nature of all the three forementioned Covenants; both that at *Sinai*; that in the Land of *Moab*; and that made with *Abraham* alſo, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. And Conſequently, that they are all of them now Repealed: The Abſurdity of this Concluſion (ſay they) is manifeſt; Foraſmuch as the Goſpel Covenant it ſelf that we are now under, is a Conditional Covenant: Since Faith and Repentance are therein plainly required as the Conditions of Life.

§. 3. To

§. 3. To this we Reply; First, Let the true ſtate of the Caſe be duely Conſidered, and it cannot juſtly be denyed, but that every Conditional Covenant is a Covenant of Works; that is, if Faith, Repentance, and Good Works muſt be Required as the Conditions thereof: Since it is not the greatneſs, or goodneſs of the Promiſes, that are the Subſtance of the Covenant, or wherewith even the Goſpel Covenant it ſelf is Repleniſhed, that Excuſe it from being a Covenant of Works, if Works muſt be the Condition of Obtaining the Mercies therein promiſed. For let Men diſtinguiſh as they pleaſe, betwixt Perfect Works, and thoſe of Sincere Obedience onely, though Imperfect, which we are told the Goſpel now Requires as the Conditions of Life: This is Certain: that to Impoſe New Conditions of Obedience, though never ſo mild, is a New Covenant of Works with ſome Mercy; but not a Covenant of Grace, properly ſo called, or a Goſpel Covenant. For this was that wherein the very Eſſence of the Covenant of Works Conſiſted. *It required Obedience with a Promiſe of Life Annexed; where Man ſhould have but his Wages for his Work, and Periſh if he failed of Obedience.* Or thus; The Covenant of Works Conſiſted in this: *That upon our Perſonal Obedience, according unto the Law and the Rule of it, we ſhould be Accepted with God and Rewarded by him.* And indeed what elſe maketh, or wherein elſe Conſiſteth the true Form or Nature of a Covenant of Works, but that Works be the Condition of it? This was the whole entire Nature of the Firſt Covenant, which alone renders it Eſſentially or Specifically different from the Promiſe of Grace or the Goſpel Covenant. And what ever Covenant proceedeth on theſe terms, or hath the Nature of them in it, however it may be varied, or leniſied with milder Conditions of Obedience than the firſt was; ſo long as this Rule is retained; *Do this and live*: It is the ſame Covenant ſtill, and not another, for the Subſtance or Eſſence of it. If (ſaith the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. 6.) *it be by Grace, then is it no more of Works; Otherwiſe Grace is no more Grace: But if it be of Works, then is it no more Grace; Otherwiſe Work is no more Work.* Works are Works ſtill, and Obedience is Obedience ſtill, whether Perfect or Imperfect; And therefore if Imperfect Obedience will be Accepted of God, as the Condition of Life, the Covenant is to be denominated, and hath it's Form from the Condition. Perfection, or Imperfection of Obedience, are but Circumſtances. If then a Man be Juſtified by Goſpel Obedience, which is Sincere, though Imperfect, as the Compleat Condi-

Condition of the Covenant; then this Covenant is a Covenant of Works as well as the other; Onely that of Perfect, this of Imperfect Works. Which being allowed, though it seems more easie; yet it doth indeed render our Condition, and the Gospel Covenant we are now under (as hath been before observed) worse and harder than that made with *Adam* himself: Since we have now no Strength to Obey, nor Power to fulfil this Condition of Imperfect Obedience, though in the least or lowest degree; No not so much as to a thought: Whereas our First Parent was furnished with a Capacity sufficient for the discharge of the most Perfect Obedience.

§. 4. And if you say, that God requireth nothing of us, but what he giveth Strength and Grace to perform, having to this purpose Promised to *put his Laws in our Hearts, and his fear in our Inward parts*: This doth but so much the more clearly evince the Freeness, or Absoluteness of the Gospel Covenant; since this Gospel Promise can depend on no Condition on our part: For whatever is Antecedent thereunto, being onely a Work or Act of Corrupted Nature, can be no Condition whereon the Dispersation of Spiritual Grace is superadded. From whence it plainly follows, that the Covenant of Grace is wholly free and Absolute: Forasmuch as there is nothing that can be supposed as the Condition thereof, whether it be Faith, Repentance, or New Obedience, which is not therein Absolutely Promised.

§. 5. But whatever may be Alledged for or against, in these Respects, as to the Gospel Covenant we are now under: This is evident, and cannot with any shadow of pretence be justly Contradicted; That that Covenant that requires Perfect and Universal Obedience to the whole Revealed Will and Law of God; and Pronounceth a Curse upon the least Transgression or Dis-obedience, must needs be a Covenant of Works, or else there was never any such thing Extant in the World. And of this Nature we have already proved the forementioned Covenants to be, *viz.* that made with *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*, that in the Land of *Moab*, and that made with *Abraham* also, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 9. Our present Question therefore (whereon the Main Hinge of the Pædo-baptismal Controversy doth depend, and which we would therefore drive to an Issue) is onely this: Whether that Covenant that will not admit of a Partial, though Sincere Obedience; but strictly requires that which is Perfect, and Universal, as the Condition of

Salva-

Salvation; be not a plain Covenant of Works? If ſo, then it cannot be juſtly denyed, but that the ſeveral forementioned Covenants are ſuch; And Conſequently they are all of them now Repealed, as hath been already proved. From whence it plainly follows that no Juſt Argument can be drawn from either of theſe Covenants for the Eſtabliſhment or Regulation of Goſpel Worſhip: For ſince the Law it ſelf is changed, and diſ-annulled, as the Scriptures do plainly affirm it is, *Heb.* 7. 12, 18. *Chap.* 8. 7, 13. there follows of neceſſity a change of the whole Fabrick and Conſtitution of the Ordinances thereunto once belonging: For ſo the Apoſtle himſelf Reaſons, *Heb.* 7. 12. *The Prieſthood (ſaith he) being changed, there is made of neceſſity a change alſo of the Law.* And if the Law is changed, there follows with an equal neceſſity a change alſo of the Ordinances, thereon depending, and that news ones take place ſuitable to the Nature of the Goſpel Covenant that Succeeds it. And Conſequently the Plea for Infants Baptiſm, as founded on either of thoſe forementioned Covenants, muſt of neceſſity fail: Foraſmuch as what ever Right Infants had to the Ordinance of Circumciſion, which you ſay was Analogous therewith, the Right they then had was onely by vertue of thoſe forementioned Covenants; which being now Repealed, it unavoidably follows, that all the Arguments thence deduced for the Eſtabliſhment of Infants Church Member-ſhip and Baptiſm under the Goſpel, muſt of neceſſity alſo vaniſh.

SECT. XV.

SECT. XV.

§. 1. AS to what Concerns the Covenant of Grace, or the Gospel Covenant before Insisted on; We are told indeed by some that to affirm, that it is wholly free and Absolute; and to make that the Covenant of Grace, properly so called, which God made with Christ; is to destroy the whole Tenor of the Gospel, and to lay the Foundation of all Libertinism, and Looseness of Conversation. In Reference whereunto, we shall take leave to Insert a Passage or two of the late Worthy Dr. *Owen*, in his Third Volumn upon the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, *page* 15. 'It cannot be denyed (saith he) but that some Men may, and 'it is justly to be feared, that some Men do abuse the Doctrine 'of the Gospel, to Countenance themselves in a vain Ex-'pectation of Mercy and Pardon, whilst they willingly live in a 'Course of Sin: But as this in their Management is the princi-'pal means of their Ruine; So in the Righteous Judgment of 'God, it will be the greatest Aggravation of their Condemnati-'on. And whereas some have charged the *Preachers of* '*Gospel Grace*, as those who thereby give Countenance unto 'this Presumption; It is an *Accusation* that hath more of the '*Hatred of Grace* in it, than of the *Love of Holiness*: For 'none do, or can press the Relinquishment of Sin, and Re-'pentance of it, upon such Assured Grounds, and with 'such Cogent Arguments, as those by whom the Grace of 'Jesus Christ in the Gospel, is fully opened, and decla-'red.

§. 2. And as to what concerns the freeness, or Absoluteness of the Gospel Covenant; The Doctor (in his Expostion of the 12*th Verse* of *Heb.* 8. *For I will be Merciful to their Unrighteousness; and their Sins and Iniquities will I Remember no more*, *page* 290. of his forementioned Discourse) Observes; 'That free and Soveraign, and undeserved Grace in the 'Pardon of Sin, is the Original Spring and Foundation of all 'New Covenant Mercies, and Blessings. Hereby (saith he) 'and hereby alone, is the Glory of God and the safety of the 'Church provided for. And those who like not Gods Covenant

'on

'on those Terms, will Eternally fall short of the Grace of it. 'Hereby all Glorying, and all *Boasting in our selves*, is Ex-'cluded; which was that which God aimed at in the contri-'vance and Establishment of this Covenant, *Rom.* 3. 27. 1 *Cor.* '1. 29, 30, 31. For this could not be, if the Fundamental 'Grace of it did depend on any *Condition*, or Qualification in 'our selves. —— Some speak of an *Universal Conditional Co-'venant* made with all Mankind. If there be any such thing, 'it is not that *here* Intended: For they are all *actually Pardon-'ed*, with whom *this* Covenant is made. And the Indefinite '*Declaration* of the Nature and Terms of the Covenant, 'is not the *making a Covenant* with any. And what should 'be the *Condition* of this Grace here promised of the Pardon 'of Sin? It is, say they, that Men Repent, and Believe, and 'turn to God, and yield Obedience unto the Gospel. If so, 'then Men must do all these things, before they Receive the 'Remission of Sins: Yea. Then must they do them whilst 'they are *under the Law and the Curse of it*: For so are 'all Men whose Sins are not Pardoned. This is to make 'Obedience unto the Law, and that to be performed by Men 'whilst under the Curse of it, to be the *Condition* of Gospel 'Mercy; which is to overthrow both the Law and Gos-'pel.

'But then on the other hand it will follow, they say, *that 'Men are Pardoned before they do Believe.* —— But then it 'must be considered. (1.) That the *Communication and Dona-'tion of Faith* unto us, is an Effect of the same Grace whereby 'our Sins are Pardoned, and they are both bestowed on us by 'vertue of the same Covenant. (2.) That though the *Appli-'cation of Pardoning Mercy* unto our Souls, is in order of 'Nature consequent unto Believing; yet in time they go toge-'ther (3.) That Faith is not required unto the *Procuring* 'of the Pardon of our Sins, but unto the *Receiving* of 'it.

§. 3. To the same purpose He also speaks, *part* 223. 224. of the same Discourse. 'The Promises of the Covenant of 'Grace (saith he) are better than those of any other Cove-'nant, as for many other Resons, so especially because the 'Grace of them *prevents any Condition*, or Qualification on our 'part. I do not say, the Covenant of Grace is Absolute with-'out Conditions; if by Conditions we intend the Duties of

'Obe-

Obedience, which God requireth of us in and by vertue of the Covenant: But this I say, the *Principal Promises* thereof, are not in the first place *Remunerative* of our Obedience in the Covenant; but *Efficaciously Assumptive* of us into Covenant, and Establishing or Confirming in the Covenant. The Covenant of Works had its Promises; but they were all *Remunerative*, respecting an Antecedent Obedience in us; (so were all those which were peculiar unto the Covenant of *Sinai*) they were indeed also of Grace, in that the Reward did infinitely exceed the Merit of our Obedience: But yet they all *supposed* it, and the Subject of them was formally *Reward* onely. In the Covenant of Grace it is not so: For sundry of the Promises thereof, are the means of our being taken into Covenant, of our entering into Covenant with God. The First Covenant Absolute was Established on Promises, in that when Men were actually taken into it, they were encouraged unto Obedience by the Promise of a future Reward: But these Promises, namely, of the Pardon of Sin, and Writing of the Law in our Hearts, which the Apostle expressly Insisteth on, as the Peculiar Promises of this New Covenant, do take place and are Effectual *Antecedently* unto our Covenant Obedience. For although Faith be required in order of Nature, Antecedently unto our actual Receiving of the Pardon of Sin; yet is that Faith it self wrought in us by the *Grace of the Promise*; and so its Precedency to Pardon, reflects onely the Order that God hath Appointed in the Communion of the Benefits of the Covenant, and intends not that the Pardon of Sin is the Reward of our Faith.

So to We shall Conclude what concerns this Subject, with another Passage of the Doctor to the same purpose with the former, in his Acurate and Judicious Discourse, Entituled, *The Doctrine of Justification, through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated*, *page* 136. 'It is commonly said (saith he) that *Faith* and *New Obedience* are the *Condition* of the New Covenant. But yet because of the Ambiguous Signification, and various use of that Term (Condition) we cannot certainly understand what is Intended in the Assertion. If no more be Intended, but that these things though promised in the Covenant, and wrought in us by the Grace of God, are yet *Duties* indispensibly required of us, in order unto the Participation and Enjoyment of the

full

'full end of the Covenant in Glory, it is unquestionably true. 'But, if it be intended, that they are such a Condition of the Co'venant, as to be by us performed *Antecedently* unto the Parti'cipation of any Grace, Mercy, or Priviledge of it, so as that 'they should be the Consideration, and Procuring Causes of 'them, that they should be all of them, as some speak, 'the *Reward of our Faith and Obedience*; it is most 'false, and not onely contrary to Express Testimonies of Scrip'ture, but destructive of the Nature of the Covenant it 'self.

SECT. XVI.

§. 1. LAstly, Whereas we do affirm, That though according to the Law of Circumcision, Infants were Admitted and Reckoned as Members of the *Jewish* Church; yet that Old Constitution being now pulled down, and all the Appurtenances and Priviledges thereunto belonging, being now Repealed; a New Church State according to the Nature of the Gospel Administration, is now Erected, into which none are Admitted as Members, but Professing Believers onely. By way of Reply hereunto we are told, 'That Infants Relation to the Covenant, 'and the Universal Church as Members, was not Repealed by 'Christ, because it was not founded onely on the Law of *Moses*, 'which if it had (*say you*) it were as such Repealed: But Infant 'Church-Membership taking place as an Ordinance of God, be'fore Circumcision was Enjoyned, or the Ceremonial Law Insti'tuted, why then should it cease with it? To the same purpose 'we are also further told, That it was no part of the Typical Administration, but a Moral Institution of God even from the 'Beginning of the World: God ever having made a distinction 'between the Seed of the Faithful, and the Seed of the Wicked, 'as Visibly belonging to the several Kingdoms of God, and of 'Satan.

§. 2. To this we Reply; First, That this Notion of *Infants Church-Membership, before the Law of Circumcision*, is but a bare Affirmation, without Proof: For if it be so, that Infant Church-Membership did indeed take place as an Ordinance of God,

God, before Circumcision, where is that Ordinance? Why, are we not directed to some place of Scripture where we may find it? Hath God Revealed it to some, and to none else? Or in what Antient Father shall we find it? Did any one ever lay so before now? Therefore with what Confidence soever we are now told, That it was no part of the Typical Administration, but a Moral Institution of God, even from the Beginning of the World, unless we are directed where to find that Institution, whatever others do, we dare not presume *to be Wise above what is Written*: *Mal.* 2. 15. is indeed alledged. *And wherefore one? That he might seek a Godly Seed.* But that can be understood of no other than a *Legitimate* Seed, in opposition to a *Spurious* Off-spring. And thus the *Assembly* do in their Annotations, carry the Sence of the place. As likewise doth *Calvin*, *Camer.* and divers others.

§. 3. *Secondly*, Whereas we are told, That God ever made a Distinction between the Seed of the Faithful, and the Seed of the Wicked; What Distinction is it that is Intended? Did God single them out, and Separate them by *any Visible Sign*, or Character, before the Law of Circumcision? It is evident he did not; Or did God distinguish them by his *Providential Care of them*, or *Provision for them* more than others? The Scripture is silent as to this also. Or did God Love them with a *saving Love*, more than the Children of Unbelievers, as visibly belonging to the several Kingdoms of God and of Satan; so as that all the Children of Believers from *Adam* to *Abraham*, belonged to the Kingdom of God; and all the Children of Unbelievers belonged unto the Kingdom of Satan? This is indeed suggested by you, but not proved. But then if this was always the state of the Case between Believers and Unbelievers, as to their Respective Seeds, and that both before and since the Flood, and that it so continues: Then according to this Rule, woe unto all the Children of Unbelievers, most deplorable and desperate is their State, without any ground of Comfort, or Hope of Relief; contrary to the Experience of all Ages, whilst we are assured that Grace is now Extended to the *Gentiles*, who were not the Children of Believers, whilst the *Natural Branches*, the Children of Believing *Abraham*, are cut off. But then we would willingly know, when *the Sons of God took the Daughters of Men, and all Flesh had Corrupted it's way*, To what Kingdom did the Children of Believers belong then? Did not the Seed of Believers grow prophane and wicked, as well

as

as others? That is undeniable. And did not the Seed of Unbelievers, some of them prove Pious and Godly? This also appears, even in *Abraham* himself, whose Father was an *Idolater*, as is probably supposed; he himself being bred up in *Idolatry*.

§. 4. *Thirdly*, Whereas it is suggested, that there was always from the beginning, a Lineal Successive Conveyance of Grace from the Parent to the Child. If so, it is strange that *all Flesh* should so soon have *corrupted its way*, that God saw Cause to *bring the Flood upon the World of the Ungodly*. And surely if there had been any such *Covenant Holiness*, as is imagined before the Flood; there would have been some Godly Society, some greater Number of Believers to have been preserved, beside *Noah* and his Family: Who were not all Godly neither; there was a *Cham*, even among them; which would not have been, if there had been such a *Lineal Conveyance* of Grace and *Covenant Holiness*, from the Father to the Son, as is affirmed.

§. 5. *Fourthly*, Though Infant Church-membership did indeed take place, as an Ordinance of God before the *Ceremonial Law* was instituted: It doth not therefore follow, that it was a *Moral Institution*, and therefore not to be Repealed: For so did Sacrifices also, and the building of Altars for the Worship of God, as is evident in what is related concerning *Abel*, and *Noah*; and yet there is none but take it for granted, that they are now abolished. Nay even Circumcision it self was in use in the Church of God 400 years before the Proclaiming of the Law to that People in the Wilderness; and yet there is none that reckons it therefore to be a Moral Institution, or that questions the Repeal thereof, together with the rest of those Ceremonies which were imposed on them till the time of Reformation.

§. And whereas we are told, that if *Infant Church-membership be Repealed; it must be either in Justice or in Mercy*. It may be neither in Judiciary Justice, nor in Favourable Mercy; but from a pure Act of God's Soveraignty, who, as he is highest Lord of all, may do with his own what he listeth; having an Unlimitted and Boundless Right to Bestow or Revoke what he pleaseth, according to the Counsel of his own Will. For though *the Gifts and Callings of God are without Repentance*, in respect of Inward and Spiritual Blessings; yet not so in respect

of outward Priviledges. But that the Repeal in queſtion is not to the *Loſs*, but rather to the *Spiritual Advantage* of Parents and Children; and conſequently in *Mercy* to both; hath been already ſufficiently manifeſted in the foregoing parts of this Diſcourſe.

§. 7. So that it clearly appears, that the Novel Opinion which hath been lately ſtarted concerning the Morality of Infants Church-memberſhip, hath no Scripture Foundation for the ſupport thereof; it being evident that as it came in with the Law of Circumciſion; ſo it went out and was Repealed with it. *For the Prieſthood being changed, there is made of neceſſity a change alſo of the Law*, Heb. 7. 12. Which muſt needs include Circumciſion, with all the Appurtenances and Priviledges thereunto belonging; as hath been before abundantly proved.

SECT. XVII.

§. 1. FOR a Concluſion therefore, unto the whole of what hath been offered on this Subject, in this and the foregoing parts of this Diſcourſe: It is now at laſt with all Humility preſented unto God's People, to conſider whether it be not their high Concernment, Speedily and Effectually to endeavour a thorow Reformation of ſo great an Abuſe in the Divine Service, as the Practice of Infant-Sprinkling hath been now proved to be: It being no other than the Change of a Divine Inſtitution; and that not only in reſpect of the Subject, Infants being ſubſtituted in the Room of Profeſſed Repenting Believers: But alſo in reſpect of the due Form, or Manner of its Adminiſtration; Sprinkling being uſed inſtead of Dipping: And ſo in both Reſpects *making void the Commandment of Chriſt*. It was the Commendation that *Paul* gave the *Corinthians*, 1 Corinth. 11. 1, 2. That *they had kept the Ordinances, as they were delivered unto them*. Certainly Jeſus Chriſt is very Punctual in things of this Nature; and he will one day call men to an account for their Deviations in matters of ſuch importance. If men are careful to ſee that their Laws be ſtrictly obeyed, without which they reckon their Authority

thority ſlighted; What may we think of the *Laws of the Great King*? And whether or no will he not reckon his Authority ſlighted in our preſent caſe, when he cometh to make Inquiſition concerning ſuch as have not demeaned themſelves according to the Divine Preſcript? We know with what ſeverity God proceeded againſt *Nadab* and *Abihu*, for their preſuming to Change his Ordinance of Old, by Offering up *Strange Fire, which he had not Commanded*, Lev. 10. 1, 2. We know alſo what befel *David*, and the People of *Iſrael*, who had made a New Cart for the Carriage of the Ark, which was to have been born on the Prieſts ſhoulders only. They might have pleaded as well as you, that this was not expreſly forbidden: But yet nevertheleſs, *For this Cauſe the Lord made a Breach upon them, for that they did not ſeek him after the due Order*, 1 Chron. 15. 13. In reference whereunto let that Scripture alſo be duly conſidered, Iſa. 24. 5, 6. *Becauſe they have tranſgreſſed the Laws, changed the Ordinance, broken the Everlaſting Covenant; therefore hath the Curſe devoured the Earth, and they that dwell therein are deſolate; therefore the Inhabitants of the Earth are burned, and few men left.*

§. 2. That Infants Baptiſm hath no Footing, nor Foundation at all in the Word of God, hath been already at large demonſtrated. And that it is made uſe of to the Juſtling out, and making void the Commandment of Chriſt, in reference to the Baptiſm of Believers, hath been alſo evinced; and all the moſt Material Arguments, which are uſually urged for the ſupport thereof, have been with Scripture Evidence, Refuted. The Lord grant a hearing Ear, and an underſtanding Heart, and an obedient Mind, that the preſent Teſtimony riſe not up at laſt as a Witneſs againſt you: For the Lord, the God of gods, even the Lord, the God of gods, he knoweth, and *Iſrael* at length alſo ſhall know, if it be in Rebellion, or if it be in Tranſgreſſion againſt the Lord, that the preſent Witneſs is born; and if it hath not rather been done with his Approbation, and at his Commandment, in order to the ſtirring up all that truly love and fear God's Name, to a ſincere endeavour after the Primitive Purity; and that both in reſpect of Doctrine and Worſhip.

§. 3. Certain it is, that theſe things will be found at length to have been of Higheſt concernment unto us; and muſt therefore be our moſt ſerious Practiſe, and Faithful Endeavour, as

ever we expect the Special Preſence of Jeſus Chriſt to be afforded unto us according to his Promiſe, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. For if after the breaking forth of ſo much Light into the World, as hath been both formerly, and more lately diſplayed in theſe Reſpects, we ſhall ſtill Preſume to *Pervert his Goſpel*, and to joyn *our Threſholds with his Threſholds, and our Poſts with his Poſts*, in the Matters of his Worſhip, *to the Provocation of the Eyes of his Glory*; We may juſtly expect, that the Glory of the Lord will be removed further and further from us, as it was in *Ezekiel's* Viſion: For the Prevention of which, without attending any further unto *Humane Pollicies*, or Dancing after *Mens Traditions*, whether in Reſpect of the Chriſtian Faith or Practice; it is highly incumbent on us, to be diligently inquiſitive after *the Foot-ſteps of the Flock*, Cant. 1. 7, 8. That is, ſo as to follow the Examples and Dictates of them that firſt truſted in Chriſt; and *to feed our Kids beſide the Shepherds Tents*, by attending unto the *Primitive Purity*: For there it is that *Chriſt feedeth*, and there alone it is that *he maketh his Flock to reſt at Noon.* And when the *Pure and Uncorrupted Doctrine of the Grace of God in Jeſus Chriſt*, ſhall be Univerſally Preached; and when the *Beautious Ornament of the Divine Inſtitutions* ſhall alſo *be ſet in Majeſtie* in the midſt of us; then, and not till then, may we expect that *the Name of the City ſhall be called* Jehovah Shammah, *The Lord is there.*

Rev. 14. 6. *And I ſaw another Angel flie in the midſt of Heaven, having the Everlaſting Goſpel to Preach unto them that dwell on the Earth, and to every Nation, and Kindred, and Tongue, and People.*

Verſ. 7. *Saying with a loud Voice, Fear God, and give Glory to him, for the hour of his Judgment is come; and Worſhip him that made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and the Fountains of Waters.*

Verſ. 8. *And there followed another Angel, ſaying,* Babylon *is fallen, is fallen, that Great City, becauſe She made all Nations drink of the Wine of the Wrath of her Fornication.*

Verſ. 9. *And the third Angel followed them, ſaying, with a loud Voice; if any man Worſhip the Beaſt, and his Image, and recieve his Mark in his Forehead, or in his Hand.*

Verſ. 10. *The ſame ſhall drink of the Wine of the Wrath of God, which is poured out without Mixture, into the Cup of his Indignation, and he ſhall be tormented with Fire and Brimſtone,*

ſtone, in the Preſence of the Holy Angels, and in the Preſence of the Lamb.

Verſ. 11. *And the Smoke of their Torment aſcendeth up for ever and ever: And they have no reſt Day nor Night, who Worſhip the Beaſt and his Image; and whoſoever receiveth the Mark of his Name.*

Verſ. 12. *Here is the Patience of the Saints: Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jeſus.*

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for John Harris; *at the* Harrow *againſt the* Church *in the* Poultrey.

(1.) A *Diſcourſe of Divine Providence*, 1. *In General*; That there is a Providence Exerciſed by GOD in the World. 2. *In Particular*: How all Gods Providences in the World, are in order to the good of his People. By the late Learned Divine *Stephen Charnock*, B. D. ſometimes Fellow of *New Colledge* in *Oxon*. *Price Bound Three Shillings.*

(2.) *The Balm of the Covenant Applied to the Bleeding Wounds of Afflicted Saints.* Firſt Compoſed for the Relief of a Pious Worthy Family, Mourning over the Deaths of their Hopeful Children; and now made Publick for the Support of all Chriſtians, Sorrowing on the ſame, or any other Account. To which is added, a Sermon Preached for the Funeral of that Excellent and Religious Gentleman *John Upton* of *Lupton*, Eſq; By *John Flavel*, Preacher of the Goſpel at *Dartmouth* in *Devon*. *Price Bound One Shilling.*

(3.) A *Confeſſion of Faith*, put forth by the *Elders* and *Brethren* of many Congregations of *Chriſtians*, (Baptized upon Profeſſion of their Faith) in *London* and the Country. With an Appendix concerning Baptiſm. *Price Bound One Shilling.*

(4.) *The Conviction of Worldly Vanity*: Or, The Wandring Prodigal, and his Return: in Two Parts.

PART I.

Containing his Debate with himſelf about his ſetting forward in ſearch of the Palace of *Worldly Felicity*; His Hearkning to the Advice of *Folly*, and ſubmitting himſelf to her Conduct; the manner of her furniſhing him out; of the Progreſs he made, and the various Adventures he met with by the way: As alſo the Entertainment he found at his Arrival, and his Riotous Living there; with his Deſcription of the Vices Reigning therein.

PART II.

Giving a Full Account of his Miraculous Eſcape from the Palace of *Worldly Felicity*. Of the Glorious Proſpect he had of the *Celeſtial City*; and of the Progreſs he made towards it, under the Conduct

duct of *Divine Grace*: With the manner of his Proceed... the several Occurrences he met with by the way; His Arrival ... Palace of *Virtue* and *True Felicity*, and his joyful Reception there: His Excellent Description thereof, and of the Divine and Moral Virtues which he found therein; both Pleasant and Profitable. Delivered under the Similitude of *A Wandring Youth*. Illustrated with Proper Cutts. *Price Bound One Shilling.*

(5.) *Instructions for Children*: Or, *The Child's and Youth's Delight*. Teaching an easie way to Spell and Read True English. Containing the Father's Godly Advice; Directing Parents in a right and spiritual manner to Educate their Children. With a Scripture Catechism, wherein all the Chief Principles of True *Christianity* are clearly opened. Together with many other things both Pleasant and Useful for the Education of Children. Written by *B. Keach*, Author of *War with the Devil*. Recommended to the Use of all *Parents* and *School-masters*, by *H. Knollys*. *Price Six Pence.*

(6.) *England's Jests Refin'd and Improv'd*; Being a choice *Collection* of the Merriest Jests, Smartest Repartees, Wittiest Sayings, and most Notable Bulls, dispers'd through the several Tracts on those Subjects: With many new Ones, never before Printed. To which are Added, *Fourteen Ingenious Characters, drawn to the Life*. The whole *Work* compil'd with great Care and Exactness: And may serve as the Witty-man's *Companion*, the Busie-man's *Diversion*, and the Melancholy-man's *Physick* and *Recreation*. The Second Edition, with Additions of several Jests, Witty Sayings, Bulls, and Two New Characters. Calculated for the Innocent Spending of the *Winter* Evenings, by *H.C.* *Price Bound One Shilling.*

(7.) A *Present for Ladies*. The Nymphs of *Diana*: Or, The Excellencies of Women-kind, describ'd as well in their External Beauty, as Internal Virtue; being an Advocate for the *Fair Sex*; Comprized in an Illustrious History of it. Represented not only in Lively and Pathetical Discourses grounded upon Reason, but in sundry rare Examples of *Virtuous Love*, *Piety*, *Prudence*, *Modesty*, *Chastity*, *Patience*, *Humility*, *Temperance*, *Conduct*, *Constancy*, and *Firmness of Mind*; with what else in the like Nature is necessary to the Accomplishment of the most *Celebrated Beauties*. With other Examples of Women, skill'd in the most curious *Arts* and *Sciences*. To which are Added, the Examples of *Warlike* Women, their *Noble Exploits* and *Victories*: With the *Prophecies* and *Predictions* of the *Sybils*, in Relation to our *Saviour Christ*, &c. And

Added as an *Appendix*, The Character of a *Virtuous* Woman in all her Capacities, *viz.* of a *Virgin*, of a *Wife*, and of a *Widow*; Wherein is shew'd the happiness that accrues to Man, in the possession of so great a Blessing, as a *Virtuous* Woman; with the Reasons, why Man's Happiness is not Compleat on Earth, without the Charming Creature *Woman*. The whole Work Enrich'd and Intermix'd with Curious *Poetry* and Delicate *Fancies*, suitable to so *Charming a Subject*. *Price Bound One Shilling.*

(8.) THE *True Fortune-Teller*: Or, *Guide to Knowledge*. Discovering the whole Art of *Chyromancy*, *Physiognomy*, *Metoposcopy* and *Astrology*. Containing, 1. A Description of the Planets, their Power and Influence over the Bodies of Men, Women, and Children. 2. Of the several Lines, Mounts, Marks, Angles, and Sacred Characters in the Hand and Wrist; and by what Planets they are Govern'd as to good and bad Fortune. 3. Of Physiognomy. 4. Observations on the Eyes, Eyebrows, Nose, Chin, Neck, Hair, Beard and Face. 5. Metoposcopy, or the signification of the Lines in the Face. 6. Of Moles and their significations. 7. Of Dreams, and their Interpretations. 8. Of Nativities, and their Calculation. 9. Of the Rod, by which hidden Treasure is found. 10. Of Marriages, and at what time any Person shall be Married. 11. Rules to know the danger of Death. 12. Of good and bad Days. 13. The manner of resolving doubtful Questions, as to Friends, Marriages, places of Abode, Health, Prosperity or Adversity, Love or Business. 14. Of *Pythagoras* his Wheel of Fortune. 15. Of the good and days in each Month relating to Health. To which are Added, *Aristotles* Observations on the Heavens, their Motion. Of Fiery Meteors, Thunder, Lightning, Eclipses, Comets, Earth-quakes and Whirl-winds. Illustrated with several Proper Figures. *The Second Edition.* *Price Bound One shilling.*

(9) A Pleasant and Compendious History of the first Inventers and Instituters of the most Famous *Arts*, *Mysteries*, *Laws*, *Customs* and *Manners* in the whole *WORLD*. Together, with many other Rarities and Remarkable things, Rarely known, and never before made publick. To which is added Several Curious Inventions, peculiarly Attributed to *England* and *English*-men. The whole Work Alphabetically Digested, and very helpful to the Readers of History. *Price Bound One Shilling.*

FINIS.